

DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION

HEARING BEFORE THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS SECOND SESSION

MAY 20, 1986

Printed for the use of the
Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control

SCNAC-99-2-12



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1987

70-230

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

H961-22

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

(99th Congress)

CHARLES B. RANGEL, New York, *Chairman*

PETER W. RODINO, Jr., New Jersey	BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK, California	LAWRENCE COUGHLIN, Pennsylvania
JAMES H. SCHEUER, New York	E. CLAY SHAW, Jr., Florida
CARDISS COLLINS, Illinois	MICHAEL G. OXLEY, Ohio
DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii	STAN PARRIS, Virginia
FRANK J. GUARINI, New Jersey	GENE CHAPPIE, California
ROBERT T. MATSUI, California	DUNCAN HUNTER, California
DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida	JOSEPH J. DiGUARDI, New York
WALTER E. FAUNTROY, District of Columbia	MICHAEL L. STRANG, Colorado
WILLIAM J. HUGHES, New Jersey	JOHN G. ROWLAND, Connecticut
MEL LEVINE, California	
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas	
LAWRENCE J. SMITH, Florida	
EDOLPHUS "ED" TOWNS, New York	

COMMITTEE STAFF

JOHN T. CUSACK, *Chief of Staff*
ELLIOTT A. BROWN, *Minority Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Testimony of Hon. Jim Wright, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas	2
Testimony of Hon. William J. Bennett, Secretary, U.S. Department of Education, accompanied by Gary L. Bauer, Under Secretary; and John Walters, Special Assistant to the Secretary	22
Prepared Statements:	
Chairman Charles B. Rangel	37
Hon. Benjamin A. Gilman	42
Hon. Michael G. Oxley	44
Hon. Jim Wright	47
William J. Bennett, Secretary of Education	54

HEARING ON DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION

TUESDAY, MAY 20, 1986

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL,
Washington, DC.

The Select Committee met, pursuant to call, at 2:05 p.m., in room 1100, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. Charles B. Rangel (chairman of the Select Committee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Charles B. Rangel, James H. Scheuer, Solomon P. Ortiz, Lawrence J. Smith, Benjamin A. Gilman, E. Clay Shaw, Jr., Michael G. Oxley, and Michael L. Strang.

Staff Present: John T. Cusack, Chief of Staff; Elliott A. Brown, Minority Staff Director; George R. Gilbert, Staff Counsel; Michael J. Kelley, Staff Counsel; James W. Lawrence, Minority Professional Staff; and Barbara A. Stolz, Professional Staff.

Mr. RANGEL. The Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control examines today the role of the Federal Government—specifically the Department of Education—in drug abuse education efforts. The importance of preventing drug abuse through education looms larger and larger as we find out how serious the problem of drug control is, not only in our nation but throughout the world.

I think it is abundantly clear that our efforts overseas have failed miserably. There is no way to really expect that in the next decade there will be any reductions in the production of drugs; and I think by all of the people who have been in charge of protecting our borders, that they have admitted that we are defenseless against the invasion of drugs.

This being the case, supported by the United Nations as well as the State Department, that in all of the drug producing countries that we should expect there would be bumper crops; that where Chief Justice Warren Burger has indicated that he seriously believes that the drug problem is a far more serious threat to our national security than communism.

When we find that the Drug Enforcement Administration and most of the law enforcement agencies in the United States have now come to an agreement that the emphasis has to be placed on reducing demand through education and prevention, and when we find that there is very little being done by local and State educational forces, that our schools do not have effective drug education efforts, and when we find in our own Federal budget an allocation of nearly \$18 billion for education and find just \$3 million or \$4 million set aside for drug education, then we think it is time for the Congress to review our strategy as it relates to reducing the

demand as we depend on the executive branch to reach out and reduce the supply.

That is why, with all of the hearings that we have been able to hold throughout the world, and indeed in the United States, that I am especially pleased that the majority leader of the House of Representatives has not been solicited, but because of the concern that he has had for the problem has asked what could he do in order to focus national attention on this problem and indeed give assistance to those nations that, too, are struggling in trying to bring some control to this poison, that he has agreed to be our leadoff witness today.

I am pleased to say that we have with us the Education Secretary, William Bennett, who indeed has been around the country in expressing the concerns of the administration as it relates to reducing demand. He will be following the leader of the House of Representatives, Jim Wright.

[The statement of Chairman Rangel appears on p. 37.]

Mr. RANGEL. I would ask whether or not any members of the committee wish to make a statement at this time.

[The statement of Mr. Gilman appears on p. 42.]

Mr. RANGEL. The Chair, seeing no one is—Mr. Oxley?

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, in deference to the Majority Leader, I would ask unanimous consent my opening statement be made part of the record.

Mr. RANGEL. Without objection.

[The statement of Mr. Oxley appears on p. 44.]

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Leader, as I pointed out in my opening statement, we are pleased to have your leadership. We are particularly pleased you agreed to testify this afternoon.

You may proceed.

TESTIMONY OF HON. JIM WRIGHT, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. WRIGHT. Thank you for the invitation to appear today as the initial witness in these vitally important hearings. Nothing could demand a greater priority in our scale of national values than the terrible growing menace of drug abuse and the illicit traffic in narcotics. Nothing less than our national security in the ultimate analysis is at stake.

Let me commend you personally, Mr. Chairman, and others on your committee, both Democrats and Republicans, for your tireless and effective leadership on this particular issue. I think it deserves a higher position in our scale of priorities nationally.

I think you have seen these clouds of America's growing drug habit darkening the horizons. Those of you on this committee are trying in creative and constructive ways to move the Congress and country toward workable solutions. For that, I want to express the sincere appreciation of the entire Congress and pledge to you the wholehearted cooperation of the House leadership in seeking and finding and putting into effect the most workable solutions to this growing menace, as we see American society teeter precariously on the brink of drug overdose.

The statistics which are so familiar to your committee bear reviewing, because they are so alarming. I hope they would be sobering. More than 25 million Americans—10 percent of our total population—regularly use marijuana. Twenty-five million Americans have tried cocaine at least once. More than 5 million are regular users. Every day, some 5,000 Americans try that dangerous drug for the first time. 500,000 Americans are addicted to heroin, and 1 million regularly use hallucinogens.

This committee has estimated that more than 150 tons of cocaine, 12 tons of heroin, and as much as 60,000 tons of marijuana cross into the United States illegally on an annual basis. The sale of these illicit narcotics has turned into a sinister multi-billion-dollar industry.

While so many of our other industries—like steel, machine tools, farming—seem to be in a decline, drugs are booming, and drug trade has become America's great growth industry of the 1980's, having more than doubled in volume and in value in a few short years.

Narco-dollars are estimated at more than \$120 billion untaxable dollars that fuel an insidious underground subculture of crime, corruption, and death and despair. If you just compare what we are spending in interdiction and in eradication and in education to that \$120 billion in a subculture of unreported ill-gotten gain, I think you see how little we have recognized the dimension of this menace and how far short we have come so far in our determination to come to grips with it.

To put it in perspective, two generations ago we could not imagine anything more terrible or malevolent or sinister than the so-named "white slave trade." That was the thing people talked about and cringed in some fear about when I was a little, bitty kid. But narcotics addiction today is truly part of a new and even deadlier kind of slave trade. It is indeed a slave trade because it enslaves people.

Drug pushers and organized crime kingpins feed like parasites on the pain and suffering of drug addicts. They sow the seeds to harvest a bumper crop of broken lives, ruined careers, shattered families, brutal crimes, and the pervasive atmosphere of spiritual decadence, narcissistic self-destruction and dangerous anti-social behavior. International drug marketeers and neighborhood drug peddlers have become the Grim Reapers of the modern age.

If the promoters of state-sponsored terrorism are to be called Terror, Incorporated—as President Reagan has labeled them—then dope peddlers ought to be called Misery Merchants, International.

Open for business in practically every city and town in our country, these misery merchants acquire new clients through the unwitting collaboration of America's cultural trend-setters, too often.

Instead of sending out the message of "Caveat Emptor"—let the buyer beware—proliferating stories involving rock stars, movie idols, athletes, television personalities seem to give drug use a sometimes subtle but always seductive stamp of apparent approval. This creates an atmosphere of social acceptability, particularly among the impressionable young that enables drug use and abuse to permeate and corrode American society.

Even after a string of tragic drug overdoses in the entertainment community, drugs are glamorized through the gritty prism of an industry where, for some, the obsession with profits obscures any sense of the responsibility of public example.

So, it is time, past time, that the Congress and the country must declare an all-out war on illegal drugs. A lot of things need to be done. I want to suggest a basic outline of a strategy here today that might be called the Three E's—eradication, enforcement, and education. No one of them alone will solve the problem; perhaps not all three of them, for some time.

This problem has grown to the point where it is extremely difficult. It defies our capacities to cope with it. The United States has to move with bilateral and multilateral efforts, I think internationally, if we are going to curtail the exploding supply of illegal drugs.

I want to talk about the supply side approach here for just a minute. It is an important part in our overall anti-drug program, although in the final analysis, as I want to say in a few minutes, I think the demand side is what we are going to have to work on if we are ever going to stop it. But let's talk about the supply side.

There are some 14 countries that now supply the bulk of our national drug habit. I think we are going to have to establish a clear policy to eradicate the illegal drug crops that proliferate in those countries. It is easier said than done. We are going to have to find an effective formula some way to bring in these countries and the leaders of those democratic, freely elected governments and see if we can't jointly, mutually work out some method by which they can cooperate more effectively, and we can assist them to cooperate more effectively in our mutual efforts to eradicate this deadly menace.

We need to let it be known that whatever benefits we may be able to provide to other countries in foreign assistance or trade agreements or debt restructuring are clearly contingent upon the expectation of sincere and full cooperation on the part of their governments to stamp out the sources of this deadly menace that spreads the epidemic of crime into our streets and increasingly threatens our youth.

I just want to talk briefly about how we set a stage for this. We have to do it with due respect and total regard for the dignity and self-respect of the other countries with which we are dealing. I don't think it is going to do much good if any—and it probably is going to be counterproductive—for us to go out of here lambasting other countries, accusing them of bad faith, if we have no evidence of that being the case, insulting them, or putting them in a position where they cannot really in good conscience cooperate with us to the fullest extent for fear of appearing to their people to have been dictated to by the Yankee behemoth in the North. That is not the attitude to create.

We want to create a desire to work with us, more effectively, more fully, more enthusiastically. I think that it could be that in exchange for really genuine cooperation on the part of governments, particularly in Latin America, we might be able to afford to upgrade the level of our own technical assistance, to enhance eradication techniques, and then somehow to find some method to help the low income farmers to whom these big narco-dollars don't

really trickle down but who do get a little benefit growing coca leaves or poppies or whatever may be the source from which drugs are derived in their country.

One of the tragic things is that in a country like Bolivia, for example, it is a billion dollar business. The little country of Bolivia would like very much to be able to sell us legitimate goods. We already have a trade imbalance in this country. Of course, narco-dollars are probably contributing more massively to that trade imbalance than anybody has a tap on or understands. They would rather sell some legitimate product to us than to sell drugs.

The government itself doesn't want to sell drugs. They don't want to be in the business of encouraging the development of drugs. It is, so far as I am able to determine, a responsible government. It is an elected government. They want to have a reliable, sensible relationship with the rest of the world. But, when they realize the truth of the matter, they realize that the biggest single crop they have in international markets is an illegal crop.

The government doesn't encourage it. The government tries to wipe it out. But it is about a billion dollar industry.

One of the really sad things is that the kings of the drug culture in some of those countries have developed massive power, economic power as well as political power, by reason of the fact that they have about the only game in town in the present economic situation throughout much of Latin America.

Last year, we had a visit from the President of Colombia, a brave man, a forward-looking, a sincere person, a fine public servant who is dedicated to trying to wipe out this illicit drug trade. But the drug traffickers are in some instances even more powerful than the government itself. I am not sure that I do him any justice by saying that.

What I am saying is certainly not intended as criticism of the Government of Colombia. Instead, I want to compliment the president of that country for his earnest efforts. But the truth of it is that assassinations of public officials who try to carry out their bounden duty to stop the flow of drugs and the growth of illicit crops that go into illicit drugs have often been the victims of political assassinations. These people control at least as much money as the government, if not more.

Maybe what we need, I am inclined to think, more than any other thing, would be for the President of the United States, with all the power and prestige of that office and of his persona, to call together the leaders, the Presidents of all of the countries in our hemisphere. They are aware of the problem. For the first time ever, the Organization of American States last April, meeting in Rio, conducted a meeting directly involved with narcotics, trying to come to grips with this menace.

We need to recognize, it seems to me, that those countries in Latin America have legitimate needs, and we have legitimate needs. One of our legitimate needs is to stop the source of narcotics. We recognize that. I think we have to recognize that their legitimate need is to cope with dignity against this enormously oppressive economic situation that just grinds them down into miserable poverty.

Our nearest neighbor in Mexico has been recently bombarded with some very vitriolic statements and some strong, harsh rhetoric at which they have recoiled. We need to realize that there is a lot of pride in Mexico. They have not asked us for any foreign aid. They don't accept foreign aid from the United States.

We built the Inter-American Highway. The United States assisted in much of the path through Latin America, through Central America particularly, as that highway stretched from the tip of the northern end of the hemisphere at the top of Alaska, all the way to Tierra del Fuego at the southern point in Argentina. Mexico, however, would not accept any money from us. They paid their own way. They said they wanted to pay for their portion of that highway, and they did.

Because of that, and because of their longstanding policy, they feel deeply offended when broad and general statements are made reflecting upon the integrity of their government and their officials.

I think we can say and acknowledge factually that there is truly, yes, in that country, a layer of corruption. There is some in the United States, as well. And I think if we are honest with ourselves, we have to face that fact.

Instead of engaging in bombastic rhetoric, I think what we ought to do with Mexico—and this is just an idea—is to sit down and say, look, your future and our future are inextricably tied up together. Nature and history have made us neighbors. We share a 2,000-mile border, and that border isn't like the Berlin Wall. People cross it every day. You could not conceivably hire enough people to stand arm-in-arm and monitor that shallow river across which people pass.

What we must say to them, I think, is this: We recognize your problem and we want to be helpful, and we want you to recognize our problem.

One of the things that is afflicting Mexico now is the fact that they staked that grand and brilliant hope for the future upon petroleum. Then the prices of petroleum plummeted recently. Mexico has curtailed their exploration in petroleum.

Perhaps we could, as a gesture of friendship, arrange somehow to purchase relatively more of that part of our use of petroleum that we import from our neighbor, not awaiting until they ask us, but suggesting that we would like to do this at this moment when they need sources to whom they can sell a legal product, and then talk with them perhaps if there is a way in terms of the massive debts that they owe and finding some way to encourage perhaps a forgiveness of some of the interest, so that part of what they pay goes to pay off the debt itself instead of perpetuating a deepening obligation without any way out of the tunnel.

I think this kind of thing needs to be done by the State Department and the President. I am not trying to interpose a congressional solution upon the executive branch of Government which must conduct our foreign policy. If there is movement in that direction, I think it would be far, far preferable.

A second fallback position might be to call an international parliamentary gathering to enter into discussions of these issues together. But, ultimately, in the final analysis, this kind of thing is

going to have to be led by the administration, the executive branch of Government, by the State Department, and Congress has to play a supportive role.

Then I want to talk a little bit about enforcement. I don't want to take up too much time. This is so important that it just seems to me we ought to develop, if we can, some comprehensive philosophy together—the bipartisan approach, if at all possible. Enforcement of an interdiction somehow has to be strengthened. We must be honest with ourselves, I think, and recognize that our southern border is out of control.

Probably we are not ever going to be able to enforce perfectly these things that will keep us from having massive movements of drugs across our border. I read, though, in a Knight-Ridder story today ways in which our Customs agents are now foiling the people who smuggle cash out of our country, going into other countries in our hemisphere to purchase drugs. There is a very interesting story.

They found cash laden away in tissue boxes and shampoo bottles and television sets and tubes of linament, and things of that kind, in the luggage of people going south into other parts of our hemisphere to purchase illegal drugs. They made some strides in finding ways to stop that.

We are trying with all of our might and main in an era of Gramm-Rudman—I know we always have budgetary difficulties. Last year, and again this year, we have resisted efforts to reduce the Customs Service and to reduce other agencies of our enforcement arm, and surely we need to continue adequately funding those people who wage such a lonely battle in their efforts to stop the flow of illegal drugs.

But then that also means that something is going to have to be done at some point in the criminal justice system. I don't know how, exactly. Stiffer and sterner, surer sentencing is desirable, I guess. A convicted pusher ought to be sentenced. They need to be sentenced.

Top officials of Misery Merchants, International ought to get mandatory life sentences, it seems to me. But, because of the overloaded courts and overworked prosecutors and overflowing prisons, plea-bargaining has replaced justice in too many cases.

With available drug treatment programs crowded and crammed full, the entire system seems to be reaching a gridlock phase, unless we can build a public consensus that more public funds are needed and are warranted.

When you stop and think about this estimated \$120 billion of untaxable subculture money to cope with that kind of a massive operation, that gridlock is just going to grow worse. Better enforcement, surer punishment, those are just two stops.

Finally, if we are going to make any real inroads in this big problem, the ultimate deterrent has to be education. The ultimate thing is to dry up not only the supply, but the demand—dry up the demand. Then it won't make any difference if people grow coca leaves.

There are legitimate uses for coca leaves. Keep people from using drugs. Arrange somehow to help people not to start using drugs. That is where education has to come in.

I support the Rangel-Gilman bill, the Drug Abuse Education Act. I think there is a good start.

When the Chief Justice, as you said, Mr. Chairman, can call the spread of illegal drugs a more serious menace to the United States even than international communism, then this effort is long overdue. Drug use is reaching epidemic levels in our schools, and even drug education is the only really effective antidote, it seems to me.

Society just cannot tolerate having our middle level schools, junior high schools, high schools, in some cases even our elementary schools, functioning like fast breeder reactors for future junkies. Education can give students the knowledge and the skills that they need to resist this dangerous threat to their lives. Effective school-based anti-drug education can turn the tables on this sleazy drug trade by using the most powerful and appealing tool of all—peer pressure—rather than an instrument by which too many impressionable young people are compelled to experiment with drugs by ways being accepted.

Well, we ought to create a climate in which the badge of courage and the password of peer acceptability is to say no to drugs. Anti-drug education has to be our best hope; films designed with a view to youth appeal featuring the heroes and idols of each age group to inculcate the idea that drugs are deadly and that it is stupid to experiment; smart to say no.

In addition to school-based drug abuse education, I think we need a broader public education campaign. Very little concerted effort has been made to disseminate information on drug use—negative medical effects of drug use, the economic costs associated with the lost productivity, due to drug dependency, and the connection between drug use and the wider problem of crime itself.

What we need is to deglamorize drugs through an aggressive public education campaign and to popularize the state of being drug free as a condition of social acceptance. Not very long ago—if you think this is pie in the sky, just stop and think. Relatively few years back, two decades ago, cigarette smoking was portrayed in the movies and on TV as a thing to do. Thirty years ago, every movie you saw showed the glamorous people smoking cigarettes. At least, movie stars lent their names and pictures to advertising smoking cigarettes.

On the walls of a popular restaurant here in Washington, last week I saw an old 1930's Chesterfield cigarette poster featuring the likeness of a popular movie performer of the time. The slogan reads: "Chesterfields, they satisfy."

In the past two decades, a concerted public education program about the health risks of smoking have changed America's smoking habits. The American Cancer Society and the Surgeon General convinced us, through repeated factual messages, that smoking really is a matter of life and breath.

Once in an average crowd the non-smoker was the exception. Now it is the reverse. Education has done the job and is doing the job on something a lot less deadly than these drugs.

Today, the same process is underway with another national scourge: drunk driving. Not long ago, it was common to hear drunk driver jokes. You remember the joke about the policeman who saw the guy leaning against his car about to fall down, trying to get in,

and he couldn't find the keyhole with the key, and the officer said, "You are surely not going to drive in that condition." And he said, "Well, surely, Officer, you don't think I am in any condition to walk." We thought that was funny.

Those jokes proliferated. That is getting to be a thing of the past. With 25,000 traffic fatalities each year attributed to drunk driving, we know at last that driving under the influence of alcohol is not a laughing matter.

School education and public service ads on television are making it socially unacceptable. Now the thing we are told is, the thing to do when your friend is leaving your house or a party and has had too much, is not to let him drive. Drive him or send somebody with him and force him to let somebody else drive. That is the way to be a friend.

Whereas once it was thought that that was a sticky, stuffy kind of thing to do and you shouldn't treat your friend that way, well, public awareness has changed. That is what I am trying to say. We need to have that same kind of public change in our awareness about drugs and a high level emphasis.

I am generally kind of skeptical about commissions. I think when you appoint a commission it is usually an excuse to do nothing, just study the problem. Maybe we need a high level national commission on drug abuse or some distinguished and broadly respected chairman, somebody like Walter Cronkite or Lee Iacocca or someone like that with, entertainment figures and law enforcement, education and medical experts and some students on that panel. Maybe a commission might help to create a national consensus on the need for a multi-faceted war on drugs.

I would like very much to call together some of the other people in the Congress and see if we couldn't develop some sort of a multi-disciplinary task force at the direction of this committee. Once you pointed the way and ferreted out some of the directions, maybe we could get people from other committees of jurisdiction on various parts of this problem and develop a comprehensive, hopefully a bipartisan assault on drugs and drug abuse and illicit traffic in narcotics, and give it the high priority that it deserves, because I am convinced that this problem is truly one of the greatest menaces to American society.

That is about all I have to say, Mr. Chairman. This is not a partisan issue. It needs a wholehearted bipartisan effort.

I want to commend you and this committee for your leadership on this very important national problem to help us ferret out the solutions that will work. You will have the active and enthusiastic support of the House leadership; I promise you that. You will also have the thanks of the American people.

Thank you.

[The statement of Mr. Wright appears on p. 47.]

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Leader, I should let you know that even though we are appointed by the Speaker to this committee, we have yet to have a partisan issue that we have dealt with either in hearings or travel missions or legislation. That is why all of us are pleased that you have agreed to testify this morning.

We all share in the frustrations. We think it is rather historic that a national leader such as yourself should come forward to rec-

commend we have world leadership, especially in the drug producing countries, to come together. To my knowledge, this has not been ever before recommended by a national leader. We certainly hope that we can encourage the President to do that, or at least to have the Secretary of State to call the foreign ministers to see whether or not something can be done.

Recently, we have seen in the newspapers that there has been a lashing out against the Government of Mexico for their failure to effectively eradicate drugs—spokesmen for the State Department, the Commissioner of Customs.

I am asking you, since we have just returned from a border meeting, has the State Department or anyone from the Administration indicated to you whether there is any strategy behind the statements attributed to them as relates to the Government of Mexico?

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I am not aware of any comprehensive strategy. I have been somewhat at a loss to understand. Apparently, it is an effort to administer sort of shock treatment, I guess, to our neighbors in Mexico. I don't know whether it is having a benign or negative effect.

Frankly, I would like very much to be able to sit down with sincere and good people—there are sincere and good people in the Government of Mexico—and to try to work out jointly with them some way in which together we can do a more effective job. As I mentioned earlier, we would be closing our eyes to the truth if we did not acknowledge that there probably has been, given the amount of money that is involved in narco transactions and given the relative hard economic times that beset Mexico today—I think we just have to say yes, there are seductive opportunities for corruption, for “mordida” on a broad scale.

There has been corruption in the United States, too. When you are dealing with something that produces billions of dollars in ill-gotten revenue every year, you have the temptations ever present for underpaid people—and many of our own law enforcement people are underpaid people—to succumb to the kind of bribes that are available.

I don't think it would be right for us to characterize our neighbors in Mexico as dishonest or corrupt by nature. I think that is wrong. They are not dishonest and corrupt by nature any more than all of humankind is.

There are some very decent and good people in Mexico who want to do the honorable thing. I think those are the people we need to seek out and work with and try to encourage and help.

I was impressed some years ago when I first had the opportunity to talk with some of the pilots and some of the other people who were then conducting an effort to stamp out illegal drug growth. They would spray fields that were growing these illegal drug producing crops with herbicides and stop them.

But let's acknowledge, it is difficult. In Mexico and in much of Latin America and other producing countries, there is a scarcity of passable roads. Some of the country is isolated, back in pockets, valleys, hidden beyond forbidding mountains. It is very difficult to get there. There are little jerrybuilt landing strips from which people can fly out of there with their—laden with this illegal merchandise and fly into the United States.

It is very, very hard to monitor the border between the two countries. But I think we need to have a full-scale effort, beginning with the assumption that there are people of good faith down there. If you start with a notion in your mind that they are dishonest and unwilling to be honorable, then you corrupt the opportunity to work out an arrangement at its very outset.

I picked up today from the Dallas Morning News a letter written by Oliver A. Theis, the General Consul of Mexico in Dallas. He speaks with wounded pride, and he says,

I have always believed that a solid and positive relationship between the United States and Mexico has to be based on mutual understanding and respect. Unfortunately, we recently saw the culmination of a well-orchestrated campaign on the part of a small group of Congressmen and U.S. officials to spit all the poison they can against my country.

Well, I think he overreacts in this sense. I don't think the motivation on the part of any Member of Congress or anyone in our administration has been to spit poison on a neighbor, but this unfortunately seems to be the way they are—some of them are responding. He said this is to hide from the real core of the problem, which is a \$100 billion business that is carried on in the United States by many, many people, among them those who finance and launder the monies, those who distribute the drugs, especially in schools, from elementary to university.

Then he says,

Let's not forget that almost 50 percent of the marijuana consumed here is grown locally, and that all of the chemical drugs are also manufactured in the United States.

He said,

Ask yourself why there is no serious effort on behalf of authorities, media, and public opinion groups to establish an educational program, spending all the necessary funds to attack the roots of the problem? Occasionally you have editorialized about the lack of effort.

He is talking about the newspaper there. I just think it is high time that we try to establish the kind of rapport with Mexico where we can get them to recognize how serious we are about this problem and, at the same time, maybe recognize some of their problems, too.

The RANGEL. We want to take advantage of your offer to provide the leadership in bringing together the heads of parliamentary groups and legislators. And no one on this committee has worked harder in bringing that about than Ben Gilman.

Before he inquires, on the last defense line that we have—that is, education—do you have any problems with the Federal Government doing more in the area of education? Do you believe we have a Federal responsibility to be involved? And this is especially so if this committee reports that in our hearings in Chicago, Boston, Newark, New York, Baltimore, that we have been unable to find any State-funded programs dealing directly with drug prevention.

If we found a failure of local and State governments to provide this education, do you believe that the Federal Government has some responsibility to provide the modality, the curriculum, or the resources?

Mr. WRIGHT. Well, Mr. Chairman, it is our nation. These are American children. I don't think we ought to consign any American youngster of whatever circumstance to having to live in an environment poisoned and polluted by drugs just because he or she happens to have been born in a certain part of our country, whether that be South Texas or East Harlem or wherever.

I just think it is a national problem. These are our children. These are American children. These are our public schools in the United States. This is a fountain from which we must draw our scientists, our leaders, leaders in every field of endeavor, tomorrow.

We are not going to be first in trade among the nations—we have a trade bill on the Floor today—unless we are able to bring each succeeding generation along with training, and unless we are able to redress the imbalance by which Japan is graduating half again more scientists and engineers from its colleges than we are.

If you don't start at the local level, at the grassroots level, I don't know how you can do it.

Mr. Chairman, you were in the military service, as I recall, in the Korean War. You were a Captain, I think you told me once, in the Korean War. I can remember when I was in the—what was once called the Army Air Corps. We had movies that inculcated in us an awareness of the dangers of certain social diseases. They were powerful messages. Perhaps some of the other members of the panel are familiar with that to which I allude. They had an impact.

Now, the Federal—

The RANGEL. Allow me at this time to advise the members to wipe those smiles from their faces.

You may continue.

Mr. WRIGHT. Some may be blushing, Charlie. I don't know whether you are or not. Off the record.

I am not trying to be facetious. That really was a serious problem, wasn't it? But it did some good. It had a lot of impressionable young American people who had been drawn from fields in the small towns and countryside, and it made an impression.

We thought that was a national responsibility. I think it was. I am glad they had those movies.

Why shouldn't something like that be just as vital or even more so perhaps with regard to drug use, the thing by which young people can so unwittingly enslave themselves and ruin their whole lives? It seems to me we could do that kind of thing, and should be doing it.

I don't pretend to have the expertise to scriptwrite a film or a set of instructional manuals, but I believe there are in this country people with the skill and the ability to do that.

I would like to be a part of trying to help create it, because we have got such great potential out there in our youth. It is just the most criminal neglect in the world if we allow those precious minds to be spoiled and destroyed if we can do something to stop it.

The RANGEL. Mr. Leader, whatever successes this committee has had is because we have made every effort to do it in a bipartisan way. This has been accomplished in no small way because of the support and cooperation, but most importantly the dedication, of Ben Gilman.

The Chair yields to him at this time.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to welcome our Majority Leader before the committee. We have known of his interest and concern and leadership in this issue for many, many years. We have joined our Majority Leader in many conferences with our Mexican colleagues in the past where we tried to evolve a more cooperative spirit.

I noted in your testimony, Majority Leader Wright, you say to say no to narcotics. And some of us, along with our Secretary of Education, today attended a White House ceremony where we marked this week as "Say No To Narcotics Week." But I think your thoughts about a high level national commission on education for narcotics has a great deal of weight, as far as I am concerned.

I hope my colleagues take a good, hard look at that proposal. We certainly need an all-out national educational effort. As we undertake to examine this problem nationwide and talk to more and more enforcement people and find them throwing up their hands and saying even with more resources we doubt if we can do more—and the resources are certainly limited—and saying, you know, we are beginning to make inroads on supply, but we are not doing anything or hardly enough on demand, and what are we doing about demand and what do you folks in Congress—what are you doing about encouraging greater efforts in educating our young people?

When we examine what our State education people are doing with regard to trying to reduce demand, we find it is virtually little, if anything. And I was appalled in our own State of New York, when we started taking a look at what our own State was doing, to find Commissioner Ambach relating to our committee a few weeks ago that the total budget for health education—out of a \$6 billion State budget for education, it allocated last year only \$140,000 for all health education. That includes alcohol; it includes sex education; it includes narcotics. So, narcotics is only a small portion of that.

When we made an appeal to our commissioner, he ended up with an additional \$30,000 or \$40,000—\$170,000 total out of a \$6 billion budget. And they still don't have a mandatory program for teaching our youngsters at the elementary level. Our experts tell us if we don't get to our young people by the time they reach the sixth and seventh grade, that we have lost them.

So, I certainly want to commend you for stressing the need for a better approach in education. I think that that is extremely important.

I would like to pick up, too, on what you talked about, a meeting amongst parliamentarians. We found when we visited some of our Latin American colleagues that they expressed a desire to be able to have an interchange with us as—parliamentarian to parliamentarian—about what we are doing, about what they could be doing, to exchange ideas and information.

Just a couple of weeks ago, we had for the first time—the European community sent over a chairman of a newly created committee to meet with our committee. They expressed a great deal of interest about what he would learn from our committee and take back to the European community. I think you, as our majority leader and future Speaker, and leadership in the Congress, can do

a great deal more in having a closer exchange with other legislatures, with other parliaments around the world, to help us foment a better international strategy to battle this insidious crime.

It is just eating away at the roots of all of our societies. It is overwhelming. And our enforcement people tell us they can't keep up with it today.

Again, I commend you and I welcome any future initiatives you may want to make in that direction, and look forward to working with you in that direction.

I commend you for taking the time to appear before our committee, Mr. Wright.

Mr. WRIGHT. Thank you very much.

I just want to say I have been on numerous visits and compartmented conferences with your Ranking Member, Mr. Gilman, Mr. Chairman. I don't know anybody who consistently does a better job of reflecting credit upon the United States and upon Congress as an institution in these meetings than does our colleague, Mr. Gilman.

I can remember as long ago as—well, 10 or more years ago—when we had been on meetings of this kind with Mexican parliamentarians. Mr. Gilman, even then, was bringing up the subject of narcotics and the illicit traffic, how to stop it.

I thank you very much for the comments you have made.

Mr. RANGEL. The Chair yields to Mr. Ortiz.

Mr. ORTIZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I certainly would like to welcome my good friend and our leader for his recommendations that he has made this afternoon. I think the committee should follow through.

I certainly think, Mr. Leader, that the education is the key. As we have had hearings throughout the United States—whether it be New York, Corpus Christi, or the different States, California—we have heard testimony from prison wards, from prison officials, prison administrators. They say that education would be the key to helping solve some of the seriousness of the problem that we have.

I certainly appreciate you testifying and offering your leadership to this committee. Hopefully, we can follow through with the outstanding recommendations that you have made this afternoon.

Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RANGEL. The Chair recognizes Mr. Strang.

Mr. STRANG. I would like to compliment the distinguished Majority Leader on a truly excellent statement. I think you have put your finger exactly on the three drives that we have to push forward: eradication, enforcement, and education.

I personally believe that your emphasis on education probably is quite realistically the strongest part because your analogy with the smoking issue, with the drinking issue, is very telling.

I recently, in a bout of insomnia, watched a movie called "Breakfast At Tiffany's" with Audrey Hepburn. I couldn't believe it. She smoked throughout the whole movie. It was awful. In those days, it was considered the thing to do. When she wasn't smoking, she was drinking bourbon. That was 20 years ago.

I would also like to ask you, sir, you mention new priorities. I share that feeling when it comes to drugs, that this is one of those

cases wherein as a nation we have to recognize when we have new and compelling priorities and accept the responsibility to pay for them.

I wonder if you feel that we, as a Congress, should adjust our priorities to bring some more money to this problem, whether it be education or border patrol or interdiction or whatever?

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Strang, I feel that the problem is big enough that it warrants an effort quite substantially larger than the one we have been engaging in. I don't mean throw money at it, unless there are effective ways in which the use of money can help eradicate it. But, of course, we are realists and we know that there are some things that just take money, and we can't do it without some money.

What is important to us? I think that is what we have to ask. We have the lives of the young Americans at stake to the degree that they are today. I just think that our priorities are strangely out of kilter if we don't do whatever is necessary to cope adequately with this problem.

Mr. STRANG. I thank the leader for those good words.

Incidentally, I also saw those movies when I was in the service. They were very telling.

I yield back.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Oxley?

Mr. OXLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to welcome the Majority Leader. All of us, I think, were concerned about the sensitivities of our neighbor to the south and some of the comments that came out of Customs and the State Department. The fact is that none of those statements were any stronger than some of the statements that members of this committee, including myself, have made when we returned from our trip to Mexico City earlier this year.

So, I think that the statements were not only accurate but were perhaps tellingly correct in trying to make our neighbors to the south understand that we are indeed serious about this issue; and that to the extent they are involved in corruption, those individuals, that we will not countenance that type of behavior and will certainly not countenance the type of behavior that has led to what, in my estimation, has been an exceedingly protracted and foot-dragging exercise in the prosecution of the killers of DEA Agent Kiki Camarena, something we had some long discussions with with the Ambassador to Mexico, Mr. Gavin, and something he has been very outspoken about.

I am only sorry that he is retiring and leaving service to Mexico, because I think he represented the best of our abilities to deal with the problem with the Mexicans, and particularly because he had their trust and faith. So, his successor will be difficult to follow in his footsteps. But, indeed, I hope whoever that is can be successful.

So, I just simply wanted to make that statement for the record and simply ask our Majority Leader what effect would a strong immigration reform bill have on the problem?

We were told along the border that a good amount of the illicit drugs that are coming into this country across the 2,000-mile border in many cases was diverted that way after the success of the South Florida Task Force, and that we may, in fact, be victims of

our own success in South Florida; but that also a good number of individuals—mules, if you will—are carrying the drugs across the border.

I know, Mr. Majority Leader, you have supported immigration reform in the past. Can he give us some assurances that the Congress will deal with this issue yet this year? I know that the White House has indicated their support for it. I am asking the majority leader what his position is on that, particularly if we can count on his active ability to get the necessary legislation on the Floor?

Mr. WRIGHT. I think immigration reform is unquestionably an important goal and something that ought to have priority. I regret very much we weren't able to get such a bill up last year. I think in the somewhat less emotionally charged atmosphere of a non-election year we might do better than in an election year. Of course, we haven't got that choice now.

Rather than just not acting on it, I would like to see us act on it. It is, as you know, a matter which evokes the deepest emotions on the part of various interests. What you do to please the labor community is going to offend and alienate the business community. What you do if you have employer sanctions, the business community is going to be upset and angry; and, if you don't, the Hispanic community and the labor community both will be.

If you don't allow certain numbers of people to come in for perishable crops, then someone's crops will rot in the field. If you do allow someone to come in, you will incur the hostility of certain people.

There are a lot of sensitivities involved. It is a harder thing, as you are aware.

We had that bill last year for—how long was it? Two weeks? Three weeks?—2 years ago, year before last. It finally passed. Then it became the victim of Presidential politics. Both Presidential candidates denounced it on opposite grounds, but they both denounced the bill and doomed it after it had been passed by both bodies.

Yes, I think it is important; no question about it. You have people coming across the border, acting not as drug dealers but as couriers. For relatively small amounts, they can carry on their persons a little package of powder that they might sell. It might be worth—I don't know how much money, \$10,000 maybe, \$5,000. The courier, the person who crosses the border with this on his person, if he makes it to the appointed place to turn it over to somebody, may get \$100. That, to him, looks like a lot of money at that moment. They are part of the problem.

I think our immigration bill, though, that we had two years ago, would have dealt with other phases of the problem more than it would have dealt with the illegal crossing of the border. It would have given some incentives for people not to hire illegal aliens. It would have given incentives for people who were here, undocumented workers, to come forward and identify themselves.

I don't think you are ever going to stop people crossing the border, though, unless and until we are able to help Mexico cope with the dreadfully wretched economic conditions that exist in Mexico. If we are honest with ourselves—let's just look at the facts.

Let us suppose that there weren't any jobs in the United States. Let us imagine that we weren't able to find work, any of us, had no

money to buy food for our kids, and there were plentiful jobs, and good wages across the border to Canada. I believe we would go. I don't believe we would be deterred by the formality of a law that says you may not enter. I think we would go over there and try to find some work to support our children. That is just human nature.

Most of the people, I think, who have come over here from Mexico are decent people. I don't condemn them as individuals. They have come here legally. We need to enforce the law. I think most of them have been motivated by something just as primitive as the desire to work and feed their families.

Most of them, I think, want to put aside a little bit of savings and then go back, get a little grub stake where they can buy a small business, or a farm, or some land, or something like that back home. That is the dream they come with. That dream becomes faintly flawed around the edges by their inability to save up enough, I think.

Some of them decide they want to stay here. It is a big problem. It is a big, big problem.

If we pass the immigration bill, it ought to be done. It stands on its own feet. That alone isn't going to solve this drug problem.

Mr. RANGEL. The Chair recognizes Mr. Scheuer, who is shuttling between two hearings. We thank him for staying with us.

Mr. SCHEUER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I thank the Majority Leader for coming here and giving us his wisdom and his experience. I think he has analyzed the drug situation exactly right.

We did hear, as Sollie Ortiz said, in our Southwest hearings from law enforcement official after law enforcement official that the answer has to be turning off the demand. None of them advocated that we do less in the way of eradication or less in the way of border enforcement interdiction. But they all said when we asked them what if we doubled or trebled the monies for eradication and interdiction, would that have any impact on the 80 to 85 percent of the stuff that they try to bring across, that does get across? They all said no, they couldn't see any increase in funding for eradication and interdiction would have any measurable effect on the drugs that are getting into our cities and into the arms of our youth.

They all said—and this is the first time in my history that I have heard that kind of unanimity through tough, competent, professional law enforcement officers, in all of those border States, of course including Texas—they all said the answer has to come from turning off the demand.

I totally agree with you, Mr. Majority Leader, that our Federal Government does have a responsibility. This is a Federal—national question, a Federal problem, in its essence. The individual cities and States are absolutely helpless to cope with it. I think we must intervene. We ought to be helping cities and States to craft education programs that will turn the kids off from drugs. I don't think there is any other answer.

I also commend you on your analysis of the illegal immigration picture which has also been of concern to this committee, because so much of the drugs are carried up here by illegal immigrants. I think it would be ephemeral for us to hope that increasing living

standards in Mexico are going to reduce that flow of illegal immigrants.

The fact is, that with the drop in oil prices, and with the incredible population explosion in Mexico, the current illegal immigration of close to 2 million a year estimated by the Internal Revenue Service, by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, is only likely to increase. It is very likely to increase exponentially unless we do something to harden those borders. We can and we must.

The former Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Leonel Castillo, testified before the Select Committee on Population, which I chaired, for an expenditure of \$8 million or \$9 million we could harden that border, with structures for more surveillance to cut the immigration, the illegal immigration, by 85 or 90 percent. I think we have to do that.

We don't have a limitless absorptive capacity to take people from other cultures, speaking another language, almost always without literacy, even in their language much less literacy in our language. We have poor people in this country who need our help. We have kids in this country who urgently need our help.

We have a problem of adult illiteracy in this country. Almost 20 percent of our adults are illiterate. So we are competing with the Asian communities that are exploding on the world trade scene, with one arm tied behind our backs. We can't afford several millions of illegal immigrants a year coming into our country, with no language skills, no job skills, no urban skills. We have to find an answer to that problem as we do to the problem of drugs.

I commend you in your recommendation that we ought to try conferencing and liaising with our parliamentary colleagues across the border.

I just returned last night from 10 days in Harare in Zimbabwe—that I visited with you, incidentally, Mr. Leader, 8 years ago exactly, if you recall, the week before Rhodesia achieved their independence. I went back to that same city for the first annual African Parliamentary Conference on Population and Development under the auspices of the Global Committee of Parliamentarians on Population and Development, which I have the honor of chairing. We got members of parliaments from all over Africa, and they were interested, they were curious, and I think in that week we really stimulated them.

We sent them back, I am convinced, to their own countries with renewed zeal to push their governments, push their opinion leaders, push their power structures to doing more about improving the status of women and more to creating networks of family planning clinics, and so forth. I don't want to get into the details of that, but I am convinced that you are right that parliamentarians certainly in the countries of Latin America, which are more advanced politically than the countries of Africa, do have power, do have influence, do have clout in their own countries.

I would urge you to think about moving in that direction and stimulating some parliamentary conferencing, both in Latin America and in the other drug sending countries, to see if through our parliamentary colleagues we can't get their governments to act more effectively in this area that is so vital to our national interest. I hope you will pick up that ball and exercise your extraordi-

nary leadership in this direction which, by your own statement, is so critical to our nation's future.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Scheuer, I appreciate your comments and suggestions.

Let me just ask: I really am a little reluctant to seize an initiative in a legislative sense which probably belongs rightfully in the Executive Branch. I shouldn't—I believe what you say is quite true. My experience, as yours, and that of others on the panel, I am sure would support the idea that a strong support base can be built among parliamentarians for enlightened international initiatives. But actually the initiative itself ought to come, and must come, if it is going to be effective, from the Administration, the President, and the presidents of the other countries.

I don't want to do anything that would interfere with that kind of an initiative. I want to be supportive of the kind of initiative that I would like to see our President and the presidents of other countries in our hemisphere working together upon and we could certainly assist in the breaking of mortar that helps to put together the support base for it among the parliamentarians.

I would enjoy having that kind of a role. Or maybe just to go together and explore some of the things that might be achieved ultimately.

However, I believe the international agreements would have to be put together by State Departments, foreign ministers, people like that. I don't want to be usurping their prerogatives.

Maybe by just suggesting these things, maybe we could be helpful.

Mr. SCHEUER. I think without usurping the formal role of the State Department, and the role of the President in foreign policy, I believe we can be a goad, we can be a nudge, we can be a stimulus, and we can provide some kind of catalytic effect in getting parliamentarians abroad to support that government, we support our Government, and let the State Department professionals take over the drafting of treaties and other arrangements.

I do think that parliamentarians can play a role in just moving things forward, kicking a little dust in the air, arousing public opinion, and their own governments as to the need for this so that then the technicians and the professionals, the diplomats, can take over and do the job.

I appreciate the Majority Leader's comments.

Mr. RANGEL. The Chair recognizes Clay Shaw and thanks the gentleman from Florida for his patience.

Mr. Shaw.

Mr. SHAW. I thank the majority leader for sticking with us.

I would say—first of all, I would like to comment, if I may, briefly, upon the comments with regard to Mexico. I know it is always easy for a rich man to talk about the virtues of not stealing a loaf of bread. Perhaps that is what we are talking about here in this country when we are talking about Mexico and the corruption, because corruption is somewhat relative. You pay a man little, and he is going to be easier to bribe. That is the problem Mexico is faced with. I know that.

But this committee was faced with the situation of having spent an evening with Kiki Camarena in San Diego and going down to

Mexico and hearing stories about a person accused of orchestrating his tortuous debt being able to leave prison. We know the country club that Mexico can be for prisoners who have a certain amount of wealth, but his leaving the prison to entertain government officials in celebration of his birthday, it was a little bit—caused us to get a little unwound over the situation.

I think perhaps that the letter that you read to us might very well have been directed at members of this committee. And I might even say the majority, if not all, of the members who did go down to Mexico and did go down to the Southwest border States, much of our comments were made out of frustration.

This committee has, ever since I have been on it—and I have been on it ever since I have been in the Congress—has been directing its attention at interdiction, has directed its attention at the supply side. Really we have not gotten actively involved in the demand side until recently. I think it was this trip, going down to your State, to Arizona, and to California, which brought out a certain amount of frustration in this committee as to the possibilities as to what we could do as far as the supply side, how far could we go, what could we accomplish.

I don't apologize for the remarks I made with regard to corruption in Mexico. I do think it is rampant. It was; it still is.

I was speaking to a man from the administration from Colombia who was in my office the other day. I said it used to be we would point to—in talking to the Colombians—point to Mexico as the role model we wish the Colombians would take. That is now reversed. We now ask the Mexicans to do as much as Colombia is doing.

I don't think we have a serious effort when we hear of motorcades being guarded by the armed—by the police powers of Mexico, when we find the Mexican Government unwilling to allow us to—under hot pursuit to be able to follow some of the people escaping back into Mexico. We could have a cooperative effort of both countries. I believe we could begin to make a dent on the problem.

I believe that cooperative effort has to be directed from the highest powers, both of this country as well as Mexico. I am speaking of the Office of the President as well as the Office of the Attorney General. There is no question in my mind they can do better. There is also no question in my mind that we can do a lot better.

Again, going back to the demand side, I participated in a program that perhaps some of the other Members participated in. I just happened to find this button in my pocket, because I wore this suit. It was the day I taught a fifth grade class in drug abuse. The button just says, "Just Say No." In teaching these fifth graders, the people we were talking about having to get to, overcoming a great deal of diseducation that these youngsters are constantly bombarded with, the rock music they listen to, the words they listen to, the words they have memorized, people whom they idolize in the music industry—I don't know how you turn that around.

I think there is something going on. I think baseball, as this committee has listened to at our last hearing, has done a great deal with regard to drug testing. I think that more of that is happening in the workplace, and it is becoming more apparent and more acceptable as time goes on.

But there is an awful lot of things that we need to do to curb the demand side. I think, Mr. Majority Leader, you quite properly pointed out what are we to tell the Mexicans when 50 percent of the illegal drugs of marijuana is grown here domestically? Are we doing enough? Are our States doing enough? I say no.

The gentleman I referred to was in my office last week from Colombia. He made reference to that. Of course, there is nothing I could do to defend the actions of our country. I really don't think we are doing enough at home, not only the education but also as far as controlling the supply of drugs.

Mr. WRIGHT. Thank you very much, Clay.

I might comment about the reaction of the Mexican officialdom is not intended to say that they are right or that you were wrong to criticize the rampant corruption. You know, the indignation probably better might be directed toward those who have been engaged in corrupt activity rather than those who point it out.

But there is a need, I think, for us to understand what is itching at the skin of our—of people across the border if we are going to create a climate in which they can work with us and we will elicit from them the kind of cooperation we have to have. I don't know the answers to it at all. I am just probing for them, trying to grope for some direction on which to get a handle on this problem, encourage them to try to work with us.

I don't know how, absolutely how, you do it. But I think there may be ways in which we can work together.

Mr. SHAW. It is frustrating. I wasn't taking issue with anything you said with regard to Mexico. I think you said something that needed to be said.

Mr. WRIGHT. Truly, if any of us were to be in a posture of defending the corruption in any country. We can't be. We have to be against that. We have to be for everything being discovered.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Leader, the committee thanks you for spending so much time with us. We really appreciate your contributions. We look forward to working with you toward those goals.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

Let me express my thanks to Secretary Bennett for his long-suffering impatience, sitting through the long period of time which I have been here. I have enjoyed this opportunity to visit with you. I hope it is productive of our getting something done.

Mr. RANGEL. We thank you.

Mr. Secretary, we are aware that you have to leave here at 4 o'clock. We, too, apologize.

As you can see, our leader has brought some exciting recommendations to this committee, some of which we have hoped would be coming from the administration. And as he pointed out, he will be working with the administration to see whether we can achieve those goals.

Mr. Secretary, as you know probably better than us, the eradication efforts that have been in partnership with other countries have not succeeded. The degree of success can be debated, but I believe every account, whether from the State Department, the United Nations, or the studies made by this committee, we can expect that more drugs will be pouring into the United States than

ever before in our history; that is, whether it is marijuana, cocaine, crack, or heroin.

Having said that, I think you know better than we do that the law enforcement on the Federal side believe that it is truly impossible to interdict more than 10 or 15 percent of what is coming across. With their limited resources, they are doing an outstanding job.

But are you familiar with the statements attributed to Commissioner of Customs von Raab and to a large extent supported by State Department Spokesman Redman?

Having said that, I know that you agree that our last line of defense is education, and you have eloquently stated that position around the country, on radio, in television, and some of the most provocative thoughts have been raised by you and your office through the press. And for that effort, indeed the Congress is grateful, and we would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you.

This morning, once again, Ben Gilman and I had the opportunity to visit the White House where the President of the United States and the First Lady stated this week to be "Just Say No To Drugs Week." You were in attendance. These type of efforts we think are vital.

Where we have a problem, and why you are here, is to find out whether or not the administration believes that these educational efforts and these preventive efforts should be merely in the hands of the private sector, or whether or not there should be a greater effort made by the Congress and the administration through your department to make certain that in each and every school, in each and every district, that there is Federal support for some program that we can walk away and say we have done our job.

We know what is happening in the private sector, but we have been using the figure—and we hope that you can correct us—that you control a \$16 billion budget, and only \$3 million of that is allocated, earmarked, for drugs—that is, for conferences that are attended on a volunteer basis by school officials—and that we have no Federal curriculum at all to offer States. We have no research material that comes through your office to them, and that it is merely a private sector venture, as far as the administration is concerned. I say that to provoke rebuttal.

Your full statement will be entered into the record. This committee—I am asking the Members to please take into consideration, as I will try, the severe timetable the Secretary has. We will adjust our timetable in the future to continue in the event there are some things you want to express that unfortunately the time did not allow you to do today.

TESTIMONY OF HON. WILLIAM J. BENNETT, SECRETARY, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, ACCOMPANIED BY GARY L. BAUER, UNDER SECRETARY; AND JOHN WALTERS, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY

Secretary BENNETT. Thank you very much Mr. Chairman.

I commend you and the committee for your seriousness, and for the significant work that you have done already, it's significant.

I would like to take a few minutes, if I could, to talk from notes about some things I think are important. Some of them I know you have heard before in the various discussions you have had. I will submit my prepared statement for the record.

I am very happy to be here. As you know, I wanted to be here and asked to be here. So it is a great pleasure to be with you.

There was a comment that we are all very frustrated by this drug problem. I agree. I think there are, however, some signs and indications that we can look to to get beyond our frustration. I think that now the public recognizes pretty clear by that it is time to go to work, but first we have to be clear on first principles.

The first principle that I would suggest we have to be clear on is this: that one of the first duties and responsibilities of any society is the protection of its children. For my comments here, I would like to draw on the comments of others from the newspapers over the last few weeks. I will be brief.

From Cicily Senior, a seventh grader at MacFarlan Junior High in Washington: "We should expel kids with drugs as soon as possible to protect the rights of students. We have a right to be protected from drugs."

Mitchell Smith, an 11-year-old from San Francisco, says: "I see kids snorting cocaine in the schoolyard and in the halls. The kids get the money from their parents. I know a 12-year-old who sells cocaine at school. I think it is bad because drugs will kill you."

Los Angeles California Attorney General, John Van de Kamp, in the Los Angeles Times last month said, "It is a sad and sobering reality that trying drugs is no longer the exception among high school students; it is the norm."

The New York Times last March: "From the wealthiest suburbs of Westchester County to the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn, drug experts and community groups say the growth of crack has been so great that it is fast outpacing the ability of educational efforts and rehabilitation programs to cope with the problem."

What we want at the Department of Education is to get drugs out of school—right now, no ifs, ands, or buts. We think it is critical to get them out. If there is a set of packaged material, curriculum material, that will assure us we will get drugs out, we will buy it and distribute it where it should be distributed. We have seen no such set of materials yet.

We are strongly in favor of drug education programs, but I have to point out, Mr. Chairman, whether mandated or not, almost every school district in this country has drug education programs, and we are still awash in drugs.

Education programs can be helpful. They can be a useful auxiliary. But what we need, and what the evidence shows works, is a firm, clear and consistent policy on the part of the adult's and the child's community—principals, teachers, parents, police.

Drug education can be a good auxiliary, but action by adults, consensus and clear consensus by adults is what is needed. We need to get tough, and we need to get tough as hell, and we need to do it right now.

We are now surveying, and will offer to the American public this summer, Mr. Chairman, a book on what works in drug prevention. It will be modeled on the publication we put out about three

months ago called "What Works: Research on Teaching and Learning." We will report this summer on what we have learned about drug prevention. Let me tell you some of the things that will be in that book we have learned already.

There is no substitute—academic, curricular, or any other substitute—for clear and firm enforcement of the law and of the rules against drugs by local school officials. Education is important. Education, of course, is prospective. But if we look at the drug problem now—and I know you have heard the figures over and over again—if I may use the term, the house is burning. We may want to teach children who are not in that house not to play with matches, but the house is burning now. We have to put out the fire. We have to grab some matches out of some hands.

Let me give you examples of what works. The first one is not one in the book, it just occurred this Saturday. I was giving a commencement at the Citadel in South Carolina, and I asked the president of the university, "Do you have a drug problem here, Mr. President?" He said, "No." I said, "Why not?" He said, "Zero tolerance, sir. That is military for—well, that's military for zero tolerance, sir." I said, "What do you mean?" He said, "We had a problem four years ago with two kids, and they were gone by sundown. Zero tolerance, sir."

Joe Clark, who is now becoming fairly famous in the United States, is principal of Eastside High School in Paterson, New Jersey. He entered about as bad a situation as you will find in an American high school. The District Attorney called Joe Clark's high school before Joe Clark got there, "a cauldron of violence and terror."

There was a drug education program going on at Eastside High School. While it was going on, students were selling drugs in the halls to teachers. Joe Clark came in, he got on the PA system in the school and said, "This is the new Eastside High. There are no more drugs." He threw out 300 students. No one had done that before.

There were murmurs in the community. Joe Clark called a meeting of the entire parental community, and the parents were behind him. There is no drug problem at Eastside High School in Paterson, New Jersey today.

Bill Rudolph of Northside High School in Atlanta—there was a drug education going on before Bill Rudolph got there. When he got there, drugs were still rampant. Bill Rudolph, the principal, was sitting in his office one day when marijuana smoke was coming through the vents. He went down the hall and found that in the studio art class a number of students were smoking and blowing it through the vents in order to get the whole school high. This, despite the fact that a drug education program was going on in the classrooms.

Bill Rudolph decided he had had enough. He sent out letters to every parent of every child in the school saying eloquently and simply, "If I catch your child with drugs, I will make two phone calls. The second will be to you." Drug abuse has just about stopped at Northside High School.

Last year, I spoke to the Close-Up Foundation in Washington, DC, a group of students. The whole hour was devoted to the ques-

tion of drugs. I asked them what works. Without exception, the kids told me that when the principal and when the authorities in their school took a firm and clear position from which there were no—or very, very few exceptions—drug use was eliminated. A lot of the kids said it was tough; we didn't particularly like it. But that worked.

Some of the most eloquent testimony—and I know you have seen it—on this issue, comes from teenagers themselves. Two statistics from recent Gallup Polls: 80 percent of our teenagers, Mr. Chairman, 80 percent of our teenagers, say the laws against drug use and distribution are not strict enough. They are sending us a very clear message.

The same Gallup Poll asked teenagers what is the most serious problem facing you? What scares you the most? Two percent said the end of the world, nuclear war. Two percent said worry about financing college education. Forty percent said drugs. There wasn't anything that was even close to second. They are scared of drugs and they want to be protected from drugs. They are sending us a very clear message.

Drug education programs are valuable, though they can be improved. And I am in favor of drug education programs. One of the things we are going to try to do is identify the drug education programs we think are the most effective. We know if we look at the City of Washington, there are drug education programs mandated throughout the city schools.

You read, as I read, Mr. Chairman, of six students the other day arrested in a D.C. City High School and identified with their beepers, wearing beepers, because this was the way they got the call a deal was about to be made—in schools where there are drug education programs.

Another high school, where 11 were arrested the other day, again has drug education programs.

The thing I think that struck me in recent events, however, was this: This is a work sheet of an 18-year-old student who is probably a graduate of a drug education program. It lists computations of his profit, how much—how many drugs he sold, what his profit will be. I have checked all the addition and multiplication. It is fine. He has got it all right. He makes one multiplication mistake out of about 20. He talks about profits, leads, half-leads, very well drawn maps.

This kid is good on his basic intellectual skills. I give him an "A." His spelling is terrific. He spells "kilos" correctly, "leads," "nitrates;" everything else is spelled correctly.

Here is a map of where the pick-up will be: scanners and burners. Scanners are the other kids he hires with walky-talkies. Burners are the kids he hires with guns to protect him.

He is a graduate of a drug education program. He may even have gotten the message that drugs are bad because he doesn't use them. He just sells them for a profit of about \$20,000 a month, or maybe \$10,000 a month.

Yes, we need action on this kind of case. I will be glad to give you this sheet. It is really a remarkable and chilling document. It is the most eloquent piece of testimony I have come across, Mr. Chairman, that points out why the achievement of intellectual

skills is not enough in school, why we need to talk about other things besides intellectual skills.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, I have been visiting schools around the country. I appreciate your kind words to me. In addition to visiting schools, I have been talking to police officers in most of the cities I go to. Sometimes it is undercover police. Sometimes it is police assigned to schools. I have been asking them how to get the drugs out of schools. I have gotten the same kind of clear and emphatic message you have.

I could give a speech based on just those conversations with the police officers. The title of the speech would be: "And A Week Later, They're Back In School."

The police officers tell me they have no problem making the arrest. They have plenty of resources to do that. The problem is credibility. You get a kid that's been dealing—dealing for six months. He is suspended for a week. Then, as they say, a week later he is back in school. Every one of the officers I have talked to has said, well, there are a few people in this town who are serious, a few principals who are really serious. You know, when they are serious and get the community behind them, it can work. If they are not serious, I don't care how many programs you have, I don't care how many undercover cops you have, you just can't get it done.

I have kept records of my conversations with those officers. I can summarize them for you.

A couple more points, and then I am done. We are in the midst of maybe the most far-reaching period of educational reform this country has seen in recent history. "A Rational at Risk," the A Carnegie report this week, had all sorts of interesting things about education improvement and progress. We can forget education reform, raising the scores, improving the curriculum, raising teachers' salaries, all of that, if we continue to see drugs in school. We can just pack it all up if our kids are committing brain suicide, because there is no point in increasing expectations or demands for the quality of teachers if our kids don't have the brains, because they have destroyed their brains, to get the best use out of education.

I can go through other things, but I am sure you have already heard them about the current situation, about the nature of drugs, things that are widely known; that the marijuana which is used, and in some places is still winked at, is 5 to 20 times more powerful than the marijuana my generation flirted with in the Sixties. This is much more powerful stuff. I don't have to tell you about crack houses in New York City.

The New York Times story was very interesting because it pointed out that in many cases, what we see is the capacity of education and treatment programs simply being outrun. There is such a serious problem that we can't catch up with it.

What do we do? I have a few proposals: Identify the most effective drug education program curriculum. That, we will be trying to do over the next few months. Try to make that as readily available as possible. Say what else works in drug abuse prevention along the lines I have been talking about today. We will put that out this summer. We will try to get as much publicity for it as we can. Per-

haps you can help us with that. We will try to get it into the hands of every interested American.

Identify model programs; identify what people have done; identify more models, like Joe Clark and Bill Rudolph.

There is another thing I thought we might talk about that you might want to consider. That is the possibility of your recommending, if you think it is a good idea, that this Secretary of Education, or this Secretary of Education in consultation with whoever you want, have the authority to withhold Federal funds to any school or school district or college or university that does not have a serious commitment to ridding its schools of drugs. This has not been talked about before, but we might consider conditioning federal aid, all \$18 billion of it, on institutions' clear commitment to ridding the school of drugs.

Again, you can very deeply frustrate the purposes of chapter 1, chapter 2, bilingual, education of the handicapped, student loans, student grants, if students from place to place, from time to time, are in an environment where there are drugs.

Finally, although it is not within my purview—it is certainly within the committee's purview—I saw your interesting exchange with Mr. Ueberroth and I am meeting with him later this week—I think you should invite people from Hollywood and TV and tell them to stop glamorizing drugs. I don't think you should legislate a stop, but I think you should tell them to stop anyway, as citizens, parents, they should stop what they are doing. They can have as many consumers of drug-free entertainment as they can glamorizing certain drug activities.

Journalists, too, I think, should be recruited into this campaign. If every school community had a journalist look at what was going on in its schools and reporting honestly on sound efforts and where problems need to be addressed, I think that would do a great deal of good.

Finally, let's get rid of one phrase once and for all: responsible use. I don't think there is any such thing as responsible use. Responsible use is a phrase like "moderate child abuse." We shouldn't have those words in continuity. They shouldn't run together.

If we find other plans that work, we are going to put them out in our booklet. If we find them, I will be happy to tell you first, Mr. Chairman.

But to summarize my remarks again, in the words of that Colonel at the Citadel, zero tolerance, sir, is what we need right now. Thank you.

[The statement of Secretary Bennett appears on p. 54.]

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Secretary, I want to thank you for your candor. You have really identified our differences of thought.

This committee, for years, has been dealing with the law enforcement people, drug enforcement, FBI, U.S. Attorney's Office, Customs, everything. They tell us that what we have to do is to deal in the areas of education and prevention, because unless we do this, they will have a job that they cannot truly perform. So, we go to the Secretary of Education and ask what programs, you know, would you have us to support in terms of preventive teaching, telling the kids how to keep their minds and bodies straight, to get treatment. You tell us we should enforce the law.

Secretary BENNETT. I said more than that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RANGEL. You said enforce the law and zero tolerance. Then you said expulsion. Then you said that 40 percent of the kids are scared to death of drugs.

We are going to say we agree with you. We are going to say you are 100 percent correct. Kick out the traffickers; kick out the abusers. And enforce the law and do everything that you are going to have in your booklet. That is where we are together. You can count us in on your campaign with the private sector.

But, for God's sake, you are going to have to help us besides telling us that the Secretary of Education is recommending that we identify effective educational programs. In other words, you are not going to say the only way to get rid of the drug problem with kids in education is to close the school and kick out the abusers and the traffickers.

What do you do with these people?

Secretary BENNETT. No, I am not saying close the school. I am saying kick out the users; you bet I am.

Mr. RANGEL. I agree with you.

What are we going to do to prevent kids from being users? Don't we have some responsibility?

Secretary BENNETT. Sure. Education programs will help.

Mr. RANGEL. What education programs?

Secretary BENNETT. As soon as I find you the curriculum, sir, that will guarantee and assure that a child that studies that curriculum will not use drugs, I will present it to you. You cannot do it, sir.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Secretary, I am going to agree with everything that you have said. The bottom line is that the Secretary of Education has given me, as a response to what every front line law enforcement has told me, what every person in the State Department has said, that we in the Congress have the responsibility to deal with the question of demand and education, and you are saying that you see your function to identify that effective program.

Secretary BENNETT. Sure.

Mr. RANGEL. Then you are saying, I think, that if you do identify it, that you are asking us to consider withholding Federal funds to any local or State or—schools that refuse to adopt the program that is yet to be identified by us in the Federal Government.

Secretary BENNETT. It is a suggestion. It is a suggestion about getting serious, about putting teeth in prevention. If we decide there are some techniques, there are curricula—and that is being studied now—that really are effective, it doesn't seem to be unreasonable for the Congress to say, "Look, we have such a problem in our society, you have to use these."

Mr. RANGEL. But you are not even suggesting that we consider funding a type of program or becoming partners with local and State governments to get these programs locked into place, and you are saying with all of your travels that I have lauded you for that you haven't found any program that you would want your Federal Government, or more specifically, your department to be associated with?

Secretary BENNETT. Sure. I cited a couple: Joe Clark's program, Bill Rudolph's program; and there is Victor Herbert's program.

Mr. RANGEL. Why don't you point that out to the Congress and say fund it?

Secretary BENNETT. I just did.

Mr. RANGEL. Do you have recommendations or proposals for this Congress?

Secretary BENNETT. I asked Joe Clark, the Principal of Eastside High School—I said, “Joe, I am thinking about using all my discretionary funds for drug abuse prevention. What would you do with them?” He said, “Keep your money. I set the rules at Eastside High School. I will do it. I don't need your drug education program. I've got a drug education program at my high school.”

Mr. RANGEL. That was basically kicking the kids out of school?

Secretary BENNETT. The first step is sending a clear message to all kids: “If you are using drugs, you are out of that school.” I am willing to submit that that keeps a lot of kids from using drugs, and that is the end of the game.

Mr. RANGEL. I think that kicking them out is an easy thing to do. Now that they are kicked out, what do we do? Where is the education? Kicking them out is easy. I can do that. I am not an educator.

Secretary BENNETT. Don't underestimate the significance of that, Mr. Chairman, because when Bill Rudolph acted in this way at Northside High School, he got rid of drugs at his school. That is a real achievement and accomplishment.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Gilman is recognized.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Joe Clark may be getting them out of the school, but he is putting them on the street. He is not solving the problem.

What do you do with them on the street when you get them out of the school? We have the same problem in the military service when we concentrate on what is happening in the service. They were tossing them back on the street rather than treating them, rehabilitating them, getting to the root causes of the problem.

I would hope we can find a better solution than that, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary BENNETT. Mr. Gilman, are you suggesting kids who are using or abusing drugs should be kept in school?

Mr. GILMAN. No, I am not suggesting that. I am not suggesting either that that is the salvation of our problem in the school—is saying kick them all out. That certainly isn't going to solve the problem. We are going to have to do a much better job than that. That is not educating the kids. That is just scaring the hell out of them and hoping that some of them are not going to use drugs.

Secretary BENNETT. I am sorry. I believe that is education. I believe that is a very effective form of education.

Mr. RANGEL. If the gentleman would yield, are you suggesting that a junkie kicked out of school is no longer a junkie?

Secretary BENNETT. Absolutely not.

Mr. RANGEL. We are talking about education.

Secretary BENNETT. You have taught a profound and important lesson to the other children in that school: We are not going to have someone in this school who is trying to destroy you. That is a good educational lesson, Mr. Chairman. We ought to have more teaching of it more regularly.

Mr. GILMAN. I hope we can find a more in-depth solution, Mr. Secretary, than just leaving it at that point.

Secretary BENNETT. I didn't leave it at that point, sir. I suggested several things we might do.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Secretary, we have an \$18 billion education budget. You are allocating \$3 million for drug education. That is less than 1 percent of the total budget.

Do you feel that is a fair amount of an allocation for a crisis problem that the President indicates is a national security problem?

Mr. BAUER. Mr. Gilman, if I may jump in, we don't want to underestimate what we have gotten for that relative modest amount of expenditures in the one program you are referring to. Under that alcohol and drug abuse program, we have trained about 5,000 teams around the country and over 700,000 students a year are served by the program.

As you no doubt know, there are five regional centers—one in your home State of New York—that we think have been quite effective. In addition, there are a number of—

Mr. GILMAN. Hold it right there. Apparently, my people up home aren't that aware of that regional center, because our State education people tell me one of the problems is a lack of regional funds for regional training of the teachers. They say, yes, we will try to get money for curriculum, but then if you can train the teachers, what good is all of that? They don't have enough funds to train the teachers.

Mr. BAUER. We would be happy to work with people in New York to provide information about this center.

Mr. GILMAN. This was the Chancellor of our school system, the State Education Commissioner, that made that appeal.

Mr. BAUER. Your State may be underutilizing the resources of the center, which again has been quite effective and serves over 700,000 children a year.

Mr. GILMAN. Do we feel we are providing enough funding to meet the needs of a sound drug education problem nationwide when we are providing some \$3 million out of an \$18 billion budget for educating our kids with regard to the dangers of drug abuse? Every law enforcement agency that we have been talking to in the last year keeps saying you are not doing enough in demand, you are not educating our young people, you are not getting to them soon enough, you are not getting to them before the sixth and seventh grade; and if you don't get them by that time, you have lost them.

I am asking you, are we doing the right thing? Are we spending enough? Are we spending enough resources? I believe we are not doing it. I am asking you, the experts: Should we be doing more? If so, why aren't we?

Secretary BENNETT. Mr. Gilman, I don't have any problem, if we identify the core set of materials, curriculum issues, and materials that will work effectively or most effectively; we don't have any problem with the idea of paying for those and we are doing everything that we can to see they get into the hands of the right people.

Mr. GILMAN. Are those materials being distributed to State education systems?

Secretary BENNETT. We do not yet know. We cannot yet identify on the basis of the research, on the basis of a good 10 or 15 years of experience, which of these materials are the most effective. It is one of the things we will try to do this summer. When we identify it, you will be the first to know.

Mr. GILMAN. I hope our education people will be the first to know about it in the various State agencies.

How much money have we allocated for that effort?

Secretary BENNETT. For what, sir?

Mr. GILMAN. Getting the proper materials and getting them out.

Secretary BENNETT. I can't give you the exact figure on that.

Mr. GILMAN. How much are we spending on the study? When will the study start?

Mr. BAUER. The Secretary identified us—

Mr. RANGEL. I am sorry to interrupt. It would help if you could identify yourself.

Mr. BAUER. I am Gary Bauer, Under Secretary of Education.

Mr. Gilman, shortly after the Secretary came onboard at the Department of Education—in fact, as I recall it was the next day or several days thereafter—he indicated to everyone this was a high priority of his and that he wanted to make sure we were doing what we could within the limited resources we had to get the most bang out of the buck, if you will.

There were a number of other things I wanted to explain earlier that the department is doing in cooperation with HHS and the Justice Department. We are using the resources of our senior officers and research office to collect the material the Secretary has referred to. We are hopeful that we will be able to identify some programs that have performed well.

In addition, we have done a number of one-time projects which I think are important. Last year, the department disseminated a million copies of a teen-type comic book. We used superheroes, which, as you know, are quite popular particularly with elementary children, to deliver the message of no drug use, and we sent a million copies of that to 35,000 sixth grade classrooms around the country. We are still getting feedback as to whether the school officials felt that had any real impact. If it did, we are willing to work with others in the Administration and Congress to expand the program.

So, I think the Secretary's commitment is clear and we are willing to work with you on various ways to deal with the problem.

Mr. GILMAN. We are pleased to hear about the commitment. I sure would like to see the dollars behind that commitment. When we see \$3 million allocated for this whole program, the whole health program, I guess only a portion of that is used for narcotics education of the \$3 million.

What portion of the \$3 million is used for narcotics?

Mr. BAUER. I think the great bulk of the money is used for various kinds of drug and alcohol abuse prevention, but the principles are the same.

Mr. GILMAN. What portion of that \$3 million is used for drug education?

Mr. WALTERS. The program is constructed to treat both alcohol and drug abuse by school-age children. It treats them as similar problems. It uses a similar approach to both. You can say 50 percent is devoted to drug abuse, but it does not distinguish between drug and alcohol abuse within the general structure of the program.

Mr. GILMAN. So, your education is a parallel education, all for both drugs and alcohol at the same time?

Mr. WALTERS. That parallels many parent groups' efforts a number of curricula, and a number of programs operated privately in schools, as well as around the country.

Mr. GILMAN. Is any other health program included in the \$3 million?

Mr. WALTERS. No. There is a data base, however that is kept at the Amherst campus of the University of Massachusetts.

Mr. GILMAN. Is there any thought about mandating an elementary school level program in drug education?

Secretary BENNETT. We have real problems in terms of Federal law mandating any kind of curriculum, Mr. Congressman. There have been other committees stressing to us that our purview is not the mandating of curricula. We can certainly identify what seems to us to be the best, what seems to be exemplary.

Mr. RANGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I will be pleased to yield.

Mr. RANGEL. We did assure the Secretary that he could leave at 4:00. He has advised the Chair his deputies and assistants would be able to be with us.

Mr. Secretary, I hope we can arrange for you to come back one morning when no other witness is scheduled. Better than that, without the hearing—without a hearing, maybe we ought to get together with our staffs to see whether these areas of agreement—rather than dealing publicly with our areas of obvious disagreement, see whether we can start working on those things that we are in accord with.

We really thought that the Education Department had a responsibility to educate. I think what you are saying is that strict disciplinary—get tough, kick them out—which we have no problem with—right now that is the extent of what is available in education; and that you are seeking to identify programs that could be effective.

If I am wrong, let the record state that your people are going to correct this committee. I don't want to take any more time. I stated it that way so the record can be straightened out by these people.

Secretary BENNETT. May I take a minute for a matter of agreement?

Look, Mr. Chairman, in my testimony I identified a number of education programs that we have found to be very good. The point that I was trying to make it's about getting tough and being consistent.

Let me put it this way: If you have a curriculum at a school which is telling children how terrible and dangerous drugs are, and that drug will really hurt them, and they walk out of that classroom into marijuana smoke or they know that in the schoolyard

somebody is dealing and nobody is doing anything about it, your educational point is not consistent.

I think we have a lot to say about what can be done in education toward solving this problem. There is no magic in a course; there is no lecture that will do it. It will be a concerted effort on the part of adults through course materials and through actions, which many times must be firm, that will send that message.

Mr. RANGEL. We don't disagree. Your department is the missing link. The cops are saying they have no problem arresting these people after they are abusing, after they are selling; but, for God's sake, in the homes, in the classrooms, in the day care, at least try to teach these kids what is right and what is wrong and how it hurts you. Then they don't have any problem busting them, putting them in jail, doing all the things you are recommending.

But they are saying show us what the Federal Government is doing, and what you are doing we don't know.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, in our hearing up in New York we were told the Federal Government has developed no curricula.

Secretary BENNETT. We don't. We are not supposed to develop curricula, Mr. Congressman. We are forbidden by law.

Mr. SCHEUER. I served 10 years on the Education Committee. I know of no law that prevents the Federal Government from developing curricula, from developing teaching materials.

Mr. RANGEL. You better not get into law enforcement. Dr. McDonald at Health and Human Services is trying to develop one for me. I would hate for him to get busted.

Secretary BENNETT. He won't get busted for that, but the Department of Education is forbidden from developing and mandating curricula.

Mr. SCHEUER. Make some tools available to cities and States around the country to deal with this problem that we painfully feel over several administrations in both bodies is a bipartisan failure. We have totally failed to deal with this problem.

It seems to me you ought to be making a concerted effort to develop materials, develop curricula, develop pamphlets. Put a piece of paper in a kid's hand that he can take home to his mother or father. That doesn't exist in New York City.

I am ashamed of my own city and State that we haven't developed it on our own. We should have been able to. But there are many cities and States across the country that don't have that kind of talent locally.

It seems to me this should be a prime goal for the Federal Government to develop an array of curricula, an array of teaching materials, and make that available to cities and States to use.

Secretary BENNETT. I think we are going to do better than that with our report this summer. We are going to tell the American public what works, what actually works in getting drugs out of school. We think that will be a contribution.

Mr. STRANG. If I may interject, Mr. Secretary, while we are talking about new programs—I know you have to leave—do you have a comment you would like to make on drug testing?

Secretary BENNETT. In general?

Mr. STRANG. In the schools.

Secretary BENNETT. Well, I think we would all start with an inclination against drug testing in the schools. But I think if the situation was so severe, so serious, that the principal and authorities felt this was one of the only ways to get the situation under control, it seems to me the law should allow that and policy might suggest those very extreme circumstances.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, before the Secretary leaves, I would like to make one observation. I hope what he said did not get lost in some of the questions.

What I heard here, Mr. Bennett—correct me if I am wrong—you are saying law enforcement, disciplinary action, is part of the educational process?

Secretary BENNETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHAW. Without it, the rest is not going to win?

Secretary BENNETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHAW. For that, I say amen. I think it is time we quit worrying about the kid we throw out of school who is nothing but a pusher of drugs, and we worry about those he will corrupt if he stays in school. We have to quit being bleeding hearts for every kid who is rotten to the core, anyway. Just like a rotten apple, he rots the rest of the class. We have to get him out. Go get him. And quit the idea that everybody, no matter how rotten they are, has to be spending so many years in school.

Mr. RANGEL. I would like to be associated with the gentleman's remarks, and I know he wants to be associated with mine, in pushing an educational program that prevents or assists this bum in making the right decision rather than the wrong ones.

Mr. SHAW. As usual, I am in agreement with the Chairman.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I don't think the Secretary or anybody disagrees with the thrust of the one part of the argument that you made. The point is, you throw him out and you still have a drug pusher. You still have a drug user.

What do you do with him? Where are they going to go? If he is not selling it in the school, he will not give it up just because he was suspended. He will sell on the street.

He or she is still our responsibility. They are still our kids. They are going to turn on other kids after school, before school, at night, in the morning, when they are not in the school setting.

It is going to take an all-out effort, but it is also going to take a coordinated effort from morning to night to make kids aware that drugs are bad for them; not only shouldn't they push them, because they stand to run afoul of the law, but they shouldn't use them because they stand to ruin the rest of their lives physically, mentally, and otherwise. That is the difference.

Secretary BENNETT. This 18-year-old with these work sheets, he heard the lesson. He decided to make a killing. You are right. The kid is still somewhere else.

I don't think school is a bad place to start. We have to start somewhere. It is a darn good place to start.

Mr. SMITH. It is the first place to start.

Mr. ORTIZ. I have just one question.

We hear so many rumors, Mr. Secretary. One of the questions that I would like for you to dispel is that we hear so many rumors

that you were appointed to this position so that you can dismantle—

Secretary BENNETT. Not that question again. I am not here to dismantle the Department of Education.

Mr. ORTIZ. You made a good statement when you said when a child cannot read at age 8, he can with effort be taught at 9. When a child cannot multiply or divide in the sixth grade, he can be taught in the seventh grade.

This is exactly what we are talking about today. We need some guidance from you. It is all education now.

I was in law enforcement. I was the sheriff of my county. I was the one that put undercover agents inside the high schools to kick those kids out of school.

I agree with what the gentleman said. Now they were back home full-time. They didn't have to attend classes. They were selling more.

We want to work with you. This individual wants to work with you. We have a very, very serious problem, especially in some of the districts—school districts in my district. They are poor districts bordering Mexico. They need help. I hope that we can work with you, and maybe in the near future you can give us guidance as to how to attack this problem.

I was a hard core law enforcement official. When we hear—administrators and law enforcement officials, detectives—everybody saying we need education; otherwise, we will lose the war. Sometimes I feel like we are losing it now. We need your help.

Secretary BENNETT. I agree.

Again, provided that one sees in education a whole range of activities from lectures, nurturing and caring adults, people that teach by example, and occasionally throwing somebody in a cell and slamming the door. That is all education. If we just try to do it with, if you will, the method of, "It is not good for you, this is how it will hurt you," we will move some children but not all children. This, I think, is why we can't refuse any auxiliary.

As a former professor of philosophy, I would note that it has long been the hope of philosophers that a course in ethics will make human beings better. It never has. There has never been one. It may give them encouragement, justification, argument for being better, understanding of why they should be better. When human beings become better, it is because there are a whole host of activities to encourage them to become better, like their parents, the law, their government, their neighbors. In the case of children, most importantly is their parents and principals.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Secretary, you did say that you will have a program for—recommended program for us, for whatever purposes, by the end of the summer?

Secretary BENNETT. We will have this report on what is effective in the schools, to you within two or three months.

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you for your patience with us. We hope your colleagues will be able to stay for a little while.

Secretary BENNETT. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RANGEL. Gentlemen, members of the committee, you may continue to question.

Is anyone seeking recognition at this time?

The Chair hears no one.

We want to thank you for your contribution. Our staffs will be in contact with you to arrange for another meeting with the Secretary.

Mr. BAUER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Whereupon, at 4:10 p.m., the select committee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

PREPARED STATEMENTS

OPENING STATEMENT

OF

CHAIRMAN CHARLES B. RANGEL

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

HEARING ON

DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION

May 20, 1986

GOOD AFTERNOON.

TODAY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL EXAMINES THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT--AND SPECIFICALLY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION--IN DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION EFFORTS. THE IMPORTANCE OF PREVENTING DRUG ABUSE THROUGH EDUCATION LOOMS LARGER AND LARGER AS THE SUPPLIES OF ILLICIT DRUGS ENGULFING OUR NATION CONTINUE TO SOAR.

IT IS OBVIOUS FROM THE SELECT COMMITTEE'S HEARINGS THROUGHOUT OUR COUNTRY AND OUR STUDY MISSIONS TO MAJOR NARCOTICS PRODUCING AREAS OF THE WORLD THAT CURRENT U.S. EFFORTS TO CONTROL DRUG SUPPLIES ARE FAILING MISERABLY. ILLICIT PRODUCTION AND TRAFFICKING OF NARCOTICS ABROAD IS OUT OF CONTROL AND INCREASING EACH YEAR. THE UNITED STATES LACKS AN EFFECTIVE STRATEGY TO ADDRESS NARCOTICS CONTROL IN THE CONTEXT OF THE GRAVE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS THAT THREATEN THE VERY EXISTENCE OF GOVERNMENTS IN MANY SOURCE COUNTRIES. AND ALL TOO OFTEN, NARCOTICS CONTROL EFFORTS ABROAD ARE HINDERED BY WIDESPREAD CORRUPTION, THE BY-PRODUCT OF HUGE DRUG PROFITS.

AS A RESULT, THE DRUG PIPELINES TO THE UNITED STATES ARE LOADED, AND WE EXPECT BUMPER CROPS OF ILLICIT NARCOTICS AGAIN THIS YEAR. THE SELECT COMMITTEE ESTIMATES THAT 150 TONS OF COCAINE, 12 TONS OF HEROIN, BETWEEN 30 AND 60 THOUSAND TONS OF MARIJUANA, AND 200 TONS OF HASHISH WILL ENTER THE UNITED STATES IN 1986.

OUR BORDERS ARE TOTALLY DEFENSELESS FROM THIS INVASION -- AN INVASION WHICH IS AS INJURIOUS TO THE HEALTH AND SAFETY OF AMERICANS AS ANY ATTACK BY TERRORISTS. ILLICIT DRUGS ARE POURING ACROSS OUR SOUTHWEST BORDER, INTO FLORIDA, AND THROUGH EVERY MAJOR AIRPORT. THE SELECT COMMITTEE HELD A SERIES OF HEARINGS ALONG OUR SOUTHWEST BORDER IN JANUARY, AND JUST LAST FRIDAY WE HELD A HEARING IN FLORIDA TO REVIEW THE PROGRESS OF INCREASED FEDERAL DRUG ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS IN THE SOUTHEAST. IN BOTH CASES, FEDERAL WITNESSES TOLD THE COMMITTEE THAT EVEN A SIGNIFICANT INCREASE IN RESOURCES WOULD NOT BE ENOUGH TO IMPROVE THEIR EFFECTIVENESS AGAINST THE AWESOME DRUG TRAFFIC.

RECENT REPORTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL BOARD, THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON ORGANIZED CRIME, AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S OWN INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL STRATEGY REPORT CONFIRM THE SELECT COMMITTEE'S FINDINGS. THEY PAINT A GRIM PICTURE OF DRUG PRODUCTION AND TRAFFICKING EXPANDING WORLDWIDE, CONTROLLED BY POWERFUL CRIMINAL ORGANIZATIONS.

THE PRESIDENT HIMSELF HAS CALLED DRUG TRAFFICKING AND DRUG ABUSE ONE OF THE "GRAVEST PROBLEMS CONFRONTING OUR NATION". THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES, WARREN BURGER, RECENTLY TOLD ME THAT HE BELIEVES DRUG TRAFFICKING AND DRUG ABUSE REPRESENT A GREATER THREAT TO OUR NATIONAL SECURITY THAN COMMUNISM.

-3-

THE ADMINISTRATION'S RESPONSE TO THE GRAVE DRUG ABUSE PROBLEMS WE ARE FACING IS TO CALL FOR INCREASED EFFORTS TO REDUCE THE DEMAND FOR DRUGS -- TO TAKE THE USER AWAY FROM THE DRUGS. THE PRESIDENT AND OUR TOP DRUG ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS -- ATTORNEY GENERAL EDWIN MEESE AND DEA ADMINISTRATOR JOHN LAWN -- ARE FIRM IN THEIR BELIEF THAT DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION AND EDUCATION IS THE ULTIMATE ANSWER.

I CERTAINLY AGREE THAT WE NEED TO BE DOING MUCH MORE IN THIS AREA. EDUCATION ALONE IS NOT THE ANSWER TO DRUG ABUSE AND DRUG TRAFFICKING. WE NEED TO IMPROVE OUR ERADICATION AND ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS AS WELL. BUT, IT IS TIME WE RECOGNIZED THAT DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION AND EDUCATION MUST BE AN INTEGRAL PART OF ANY SOLUTION TO THE DRUG PROBLEM THREATENING OUR NATION. WE SHOULD BE TAKING IMMEDIATE ACTION TO EDUCATE OUR CHILDREN TO RESIST THE MASSIVE ONSLAUGHT OF DRUGS FLOODING OUR COMMUNITIES.

IN OUR HEARINGS, HOWEVER, WE HAVE BEEN UNABLE TO DISCERN AN EFFECTIVE FEDERAL PRESENCE TO AID STATES AND LOCAL SCHOOLS IN DEVELOPING EFFECTIVE DRUG EDUCATION PROGRAMS. UNDER THIS ADMINISTRATION, THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION IS SPENDING ONLY \$3 MILLION FOR DRUG EDUCATION NATIONWIDE OUT OF A TOTAL BUDGET OF NEARLY \$18 BILLION. FUNDING FOR DRUG ABUSE SERVICES INCLUDING PREVENTION HAVE BEEN CUT BY OVER 40 PERCENT. THERE IS SIMPLY NO FEDERAL PROGRAM TO "TAKE THE USER AWAY FROM THE DRUGS."

IN OUR HEARINGS WE HAVE FOUND A STRONG CONSENSUS FOR COMPREHENSIVE, SCHOOL-BASED, DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION PROGRAMS SPANNING GRADES K-12. BUT STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS LACK THE

RESOURCES AND EXPERTISE TO MOUNT SUCH AN EFFORT ON THEIR OWN. FEDERAL LEADERSHIP IS NEEDED AT THE HIGHEST LEVELS OF OUR GOVERNMENT TO ENCOURAGE AND SUPPORT A NATIONWIDE, DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION EFFORT.

WE ARE PLEASED TO HAVE AS OUR LEADOFF WITNESS TODAY THE MAJORITY LEADER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, THE HONORABLE JIM WRIGHT FROM TEXAS. HIS STATE HAS BEEN ONE OF THE HARDEST HIT BY NARCOTICS, AS DRUG SMUGGLING ACROSS THE SOUTHWEST BORDER HAS INCREASED SHARPLY AND AS TRAFFICKERS CONTINUE TO PENETRATE OUR SHORES THROUGH THE GULF OF MEXICO. WE LOOK FORWARD TO HEARING HIS THOUGHTS ON HOW WE CAN BEGIN TO WIN THE WAR ON DRUGS.

WE ARE ALSO PLEASED TO HAVE WITH US EDUCATION SECRETARY WILLIAM BENNETT. WE LOOK FORWARD TO DISCUSSING WITH HIM HOW WE CAN ENHANCE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S SUPPORT FOR DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION.

BEFORE HEARING FROM OUR WITNESS, I YIELD TO ANY OF MY COLLEAGUES ON THE COMMITTEE WHO MAY WISH TO MAKE OPENING STATEMENTS.

OPENING STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE BENJAMIN A. GILMAN (22ND-N.Y.)
AT THE HEARING ON DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION AND EDUCATION
MAY 20, 1986

THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. IT IS A PLEASURE FOR ME TO ALSO WELCOME THE DISTINGUISHED MAJORITY LEADER, MR. JIM WRIGHT, AND OUR DISTINGUISHED SECRETARY OF EDUCATION, MR. WILLIAM BENNETT. THEIR PRESENCE HERE TODAY IS A CLEAR INDICATION OF THEIR RECOGNITION OF THE PROBLEM OF DRUG USE FACED BY SCHOOL SYSTEMS AROUND THE COUNTRY AND THEIR COMMITMENT TO HELP COMBAT THIS DEADLY MENACE THAT IS JEOPARDIZING THE HEALTH OF OUR CITIZENS AND UNDERMINING OUR SOCIETAL INSTITUTIONS.

DRUG ABUSE HAS REACHED EPIDEMIC PROPORTIONS IN THIS NATION, AND VIRTUALLY NO NATION OF THE WORLD HAS ESCAPED THE CLUTCHES OF THE DRUG TRAFFICKERS WHO WILL STOP AT NOTHING IN PEDDLING THEIR DEADLY WARES. IN RESPONSE TO THIS THREAT, OUR GOVERNMENT HAS MOUNTED AN ENFORCEMENT AND INTERDICTION PROGRAM DESIGNED TO SEIZE AND CONFISCATE DRUGS BEING TRAFFICKED TO THIS NATION FROM ABROAD. TASK FORCES HAVE BEEN FORMED; INCREASED MILITARY PARTICIPATION IS BEING UTILIZED, AND STILL THE FLOOD OF DRUGS TO OUR SCHOOLS IN THE FORM OF COCAINE, MARIJUANA, HEROIN, AND OTHER PSYCHOTROPIC SUBSTANCES WILL BE GREATER THIS YEAR THAN EVER BEFORE.

IN JANUARY, OUR NARCOTICS SELECT COMMITTEE TRAVELED TO OUR SOUTHWEST BORDER REGION TO OBTAIN INFORMATION ON THE INCREASING FLOW OF DRUGS ALONG OUR 2,000 MILE BORDER WITH MEXICO. RECENT REPORTS HAVE HIGHLIGHTED THE CRISIS SITUATION THAT WE FACE IN THAT REGION, AND CONFIRM WHAT WE WERE TOLD BY ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS IN THE REGION, NAMELY, THAT INCREASED MONEY,

RESOURCES, AND PERSONNEL ALONG THE BORDER COULD NOT STOP THE FLOW OF DRUGS COMING TO OUR COUNTRY. THESE ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS TOLD US THAT ONLY BY REDUCING DEMAND IN THIS COUNTRY, WITH EFFECTIVE DRUG EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND LAW ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS, COULD ANY HEADWAY AGAINST THE DRUG TRAFFICKERS BE MADE. SIMILAR TESTIMONY WAS PRESENTED AT OUR SELECT COMMITTEE HEARING ON DRUG TRAFFICKING AND ABUSE IN SOUTH FLORIDA THAT WAS HELD THIS PAST FRIDAY IN MIAMI, FLORIDA.

MR. CHAIRMAN, THE HIGH SCHOOL CLASS OF 1985 SHOWED A DRAMATIC INCREASE IN THE USE OF COCAINE AFTER A FIVE-YEAR DECLINE IN TEENAGE DRUG ABUSE. NINETY PERCENT OF ADOLESCENT CALLERS TO A NATIONAL DRUG ABUSE HOTLINE INDICATED THAT THEY WERE MIXING AT LEAST THREE DRUGS AT A TIME, AND ALMOST ONE IN FIVE REPORTED ATTEMPTING SUICIDE.

DESPITE THE NEED FOR INCREASED EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES, WE FIND THAT ONLY A SMALL PORTION OF THE FEDERAL ANTI-NARCOTICS BUDGET IS EARMARKED FOR EDUCATION. WE HAVE POURED HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS INTO ENFORCEMENT AND INTERDICTION AND FIND THAT THE DRUG PROBLEM IS GETTING WORSE, NOT BETTER. CLEARLY INCREASED FUNDING SUPPORT FOR DRUG EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN OUR SCHOOLS IS ESSENTIAL. THE QUESTION IS, CAN WE EXPECT SUCH A RESPONSE AT THIS CRUCIAL TIME.

TODAY WE WILL HEAR THE THOUGHTS AND SUGGESTIONS FROM OUR DISTINGUISHED MAJORITY LEADER AND SECRETARY OF EDUCATION AND I LOOK FORWARD TO THEIR TESTIMONY.

THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MICHAEL G. OXLEY
8TH DISTRICT (OHIO)

COMMITTEE ON
ENERGY AND COMMERCE
SELECT COMMITTEE ON
NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL
CONGRESSIONAL RURAL CAUCUS

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

(6)

1108 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON DC 20515
(202) 225-2876

1121 WEST ELM PLAZA
LIMA, OH 45805

110 WEST MAIN CROSS STREET
ROOM 212
FINDLAY, OH 45840

24 WEST THIRD STREET
ROOM 314
MANSFIELD, OH 44902

TOLL FREE IN OHIO
1-800-472-4154

Statement of the Honorable Michael G. Oxley of Ohio
Before the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control
Hearing on Drug Abuse Prevention Education

May 20, 1986

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate having the opportunity to make a brief statement and to express my warm welcome to Education Secretary William Bennett. Secretary Bennett is a strong advocate of tough policies to rid our schools of drugs, and I expect his testimony this afternoon to be quite enlightening.

Both as a member of this panel and as the father of a teenage son, I share my colleagues' concern about the growing menace of drugs in schools. We know that drug abuse by young people has reached epidemic proportions in our country. In fact, drug use among young people is higher in the United States than in any other industrialized nation. The most frightening statistics show that young people are beginning to experiment with drugs and alcohol at a very early age, often as early as the fourth grade. And sadly, drug abuse has been linked to the increased number of teenage suicides that have been occurring in recent years.

Congressman Oxley
Page 2
May 20, 1986

The drug problem in our schools is not new. Nor is it limited to the big cities. Our committee held a hearing four years ago in my predominantly rural congressional district in Ohio. At that hearing, we learned that in a high school in one of the smallest rural communities in my district, one-third of the students had used marijuana and almost 10 percent had taken cocaine. Even more alarming was the fact that virtually all the students knew where to get drugs, regardless of whether they had used them or not. There was always an available connection at the school. Judging by recent nationwide surveys revealing that cocaine use (and now, crack) is up in every region of the country except the South, I can only conclude that the problem in my district, too, has gotten worse, not better, in the past four years.

Two reasons often cited for the persistence of the drug problem in the United States are a perception that drug use is a normal, even acceptable, part of growing up, and pressure from friends to use drugs. To combat drug use, then, that norm must be changed, and young people must learn how to resist pressures to use drugs.

Congressman Oxley
Page 3
May 20, 1986

I believe drug education efforts must begin at home. But I don't think parents can solve this problem alone. Educators, through their leadership role, can play a vital role in teaching young people about the devastating impact of drugs. We can't solve the drug problem solely by reducing the supply of drugs coming in to this country. We have to reduce the demand for drugs, too, and the best place to start is with our young people.

Again, I thank Secretary Bennett for joining us this afternoon and look forward to hearing his testimony.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF HOUSE MAJORITY LEADER JIM WRIGHT

Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control

May 20, 1986 2:00 p.m.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the invitation to appear today as the initial witness in these vitally important hearings. Nothing should command a greater priority in our scale of national values than the terrible and growing menace of drug abuse and the illicit traffic in narcotics.

Let me commend you, personally, Mr. Chairman, and others on your committee, both Democrats and Republicans, for your tireless and effective leadership on this issue. You have seen the clouds of America's growing drug habit darkening on the horizon and are trying in creative and constructive ways to move the Congress and the country toward workable solutions. For that, I express the sincere appreciation of the entire Congress and pledge to you the wholehearted cooperation of the House leadership.

As we meet, American society teeters precariously on the brink of a drug overdose. The statistics, so familiar to this committee, bear reviewing. They are alarming and, one must hope, sobering.

*More than 25 million Americans -- fully one-tenth of our population -- regularly use marijuana.

*Twenty-five million Americans have tried cocaine at least once, more than five million are regular users, and every day some 5,000 Americans try this dangerous drug for the first time.

*500,000 Americans are addicted to heroin.

*Hallucinogens are used regularly by one million Americans.

This committee has estimated that more than 150 tons of cocaine, 12 tons of heroin, and as much as 60,000 tons of marijuana will cross into the United States illegally this year.

Page Two

The sale of illicit narcotics in the United States has turned into a sinister, multi-billion dollar industry. While so many of our basic industries -- steel, machine tools, farming -- have suffered heavy losses in recent years, the drug trade is booming.

Drugs have become America's great "Growth Industry" of the 1980s, having more than doubled in volume and in value in a few short years. "Narcodollars," estimated at well over 120 billion untaxable dollars, fuel an insidious, underground sub-culture of crime and corruption, death and despair.

Two generations ago, we couldn't imagine anything more terrible, more malevolent and sinister, than the so-named White Slave Trade. But narcotics addiction today is part of a new and even deadlier kind of Slave Trade.

Drug pushers and organized crime kingpins feed like parasites on the pain and suffering of drug addicts. They sow the seeds and harvest a bumper crop of broken lives, ruined careers, shattered families, brutal crimes, and a pervasive atmosphere of spiritual decadence, narcissistic self-destruction, and dangerous anti-social behavior. International drug marketeers and neighborhood dope peddlers have become the Grim Reapers of the modern age.

If the promoters of state-sponsored terrorism are "Terror, Inc."-- as President Reagan labeled them -- dope peddlers safely can be called Misery Merchants International.

Open for business in practically every city and town in America, these misery merchants acquire new clients through the unwitting collaboration of American cultural trend-setters.

Instead of sending out the message "Caveat Emptor" -- Let The Buyer Beware -- proliferating stories involving rock stars, movie idols, athletes and television personalities seem to give drug use a sometimes subtle, always seductive stamp of approval. This creates an atmosphere of social acceptability, particularly among the impressionable young, that enables drug use and abuse to permeate and corrode American society.

Page Three

Even after a string of tragic drug overdoses in the entertainment community, drugs are glamorized through the glittery prism of an industry where for some the obsession with profits obscures any sense of the responsibility of public example.

It is time -- indeed past time -- for the Congress and the country to declare all-out war on illegal drugs. Many things need to be done. Let me concentrate here on just three. We need a frontal attack on drugs in three key areas. We might call this the strategy of the Three E's -- Eradication, Enforcement, and Education.

The United States must move boldly forward with bilateral and multilateral efforts to curtail the exploding supply of illegal drugs. This "Supply Side" approach is an important part in the overall anti-drug program.

For eradication to work, we must do three or four things, probably all at the same time.

First, we need to establish a clear policy to eradicate illegal drug crops within the 14 countries that supply our national drug habit. We should find an effective formula to tie bilateral and multilateral foreign assistance to effective drug crop eradication programs.

We should let it be known that whatever benefits we may provide to other countries in foreign assistance, trade agreements and debt restructuring are clearly contingent upon the expectation of sincere and full cooperation on the parts of their governments to stamp out the sources of this deadly menace which spreads the epidemic of crime into our streets and increasingly threatens our youth.

Page Four

In exchange for truly genuine cooperation on the part of governments in Latin America particularly, we well could afford to upgrade the level of our own technical assistance, to enhance eradication techniques and to help low-income farmers -- to whom the big narco-money never does really trickle down -- to shift from the growing of drugs to more benign crops.

Second, enforcement and international drug interdiction must be strengthened. Our southern border, according to experts, is out of control. The Customs Service, the Coast Guard, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the FBI, the armed services and even the national guard must be given appropriate tasks as part of a national full-court press against drug smuggling and selling.

Enforcement also means clearing up the mess in the criminal justice system. Stiffer and surer sentencing is a necessity. Convicted pushers should be sentenced, and top officials of Misery Merchants International probably should be given mandatory life sentences. Because of overloaded courts, overworked prosecutors, and overflowing prisons, plea bargaining has replaced justice. With available drug treatment programs crammed full, the entire system has reached the gridlock phase. Unless we can build a public consensus that more public funds are needed at every level of the enforcement system, the gridlock can only grow worse.

Better enforcement and surer punishment can help to slow down the deadly recruitment game by which practitioners fatten their purses or feed their own habits by enslaving and victimizing others. But something more is needed.

The ultimate deterrent in the war on drugs is for people to stop using them. Far better yet, never start using them. That's where

Page Five

education comes in. I strongly support the Rangel-Gilman bill (H.R. 4155), the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1986. When the Chief Justice of the U. S. Supreme Court can call the spread of illegal drugs a more serious menace to the U. S. even than international Communism, this program is critically needed and long overdue.

With drug use reaching epidemic levels in our schools, anti-drug education is the only really effective antidote. Society cannot tolerate having our junior high and high schools -- in some cases, even our elementary schools -- functioning like fast breeder reactors for future junkies. Education can give students the knowledge and skills they need to resist a dangerous threat to their own lives and their own futures.

Effective school-based anti-drug education can turn the tables on the sleazy drug trade by using the powerful and appealing tool of peer pressure. Rather than an instrument by which too many impressionable youths are compelled to experiment with drugs in order to be accepted, we must create a climate in which the badge of courage and password of social peer acceptability is to say "no" to drugs. Anti-drug education has to be our best hope against drugs. Films designed with a view to youth appeal, featuring the heroes and idols of each age group, must inculcate the awareness that drugs are deadly, and the idea that it's stupid to experiment and smart to say "no."

In addition to school-based drug abuse education, we need a broader public education campaign. Little concerted effort has been made to disseminate information on drug abuse -- the negative medical effects of drug use, the economic costs associated with lost productivity due to drug dependency. We also need to make the public aware of the connection between drug use and the wider problem of crime.

What we need is to deglamorize drugs through an aggressive public education campaign. Toward this end, celebrities, public officials,

Page Six

and ordinary citizens alike should get organized to help dramatize the drug crisis and popularize the state of being drug-free as the condition of social acceptability.

Not so very long ago, cigarette-smoking was portrayed in the movies and on TV as the thing to do. Athletes and movie stars lent their names and pictures to the advertising. On the walls of a popular restaurant here in Washington last week I saw an old 1930's Chesterfield cigarette poster featuring the likeness of a popular movie performer of the time. The slogan reads -- Chesterfields: They Satisfy.

In the past two decades a concerted public education program about the health risks of smoking has changed America's smoking habits. The American Cancer Society and the Surgeon General convinced us through repeated factual messages that smoking really was a matter of Life and Breath. Once in an average crowd the non-smoker was the exception. Now it is the reverse.

Today the same process is underway with another national scourge -- drunk driving. Not long ago, it was common to hear drunk driver jokes. I remember one joke in which a policeman pulls a swerving car over and, seeing that the driver is inebriated, asks: "You're not going to drive in that condition, are you?" To which the driver responds: "Gosh officer, surely you can see I'm in no condition to walk." Just a few years ago we laughed tolerantly.

That's a thing of the past. With 25,000 traffic fatalities each year attributable to drunk driving, we know at last that driving under the influence of alcohol is no laughing matter. School education and public service ads on television are making it socially unacceptable.

We need the same kind of public awareness about drugs, and a high level emphasis. Maybe one way to stir the public's interest and arouse

Page Seven

the public ire is through a high-level national commission on drug abuse. With a distinguished and respected chairman (perhaps someone like Walter Cronkite or Lee Iacocca) and with leading entertainment figures, law enforcement, education and medical experts -- and, yes, some students -- on the panel, such a commission could help to create a national consensus on the need for a multi-faceted war on drugs.

That's about all I came here to say, Mr. Chairman. This is not a partisan issue. It needs a wholehearted bipartisan effort. I want to commend you and this committee for your leadership on this very important national problem. Ferret out the solutions that will work and you'll have the active, enthusiastic support of the House leadership -- and the thanks of the American people.

TESTIMONY OF
WILLIAM J. BENNETT
SECRETARY OF EDUCATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

BEFORE THE HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE
ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL
May 20, 1986

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am pleased to be here today to testify on the problem of drug use among America's schoolchildren.

As you know, drug abuse is an issue that has long been of concern to this Administration. The First Lady has made it a special priority, and has traveled across the country -- and around the world -- addressing the issue of protecting our children from drugs. Her "Just Say No" campaign has become the nation's foremost effort to encourage children to resist pressure to use drugs.

For me, student drug use has been a concern long before my arrival at the Department of Education -- or even in Washington. That concern has deepened during my tenure as Secretary. In recent months, I have been discussing this problem with parents and educators on visits to schools throughout the country. In addition, I have been meeting with narcotics officers around the country to discuss the problem of school-age drug abuse.

Today there are several challenges facing American education. Recently, we've been hearing a good deal about the poor reading and writing abilities of students of all ages. Not long

ago, we saw a study showing that in mathematics, American students perform below students from nearly all other industrialized nations. And there are, I think, some more profound, structural problems in our educational system: problems with the supply and certification of teachers, for example.

These problems are important and pressing, and require considerable attention and hard work. I think we are beginning to see the results of recent efforts. Recently, SAT scores, graduation rates, and academic standards have risen in many states.

But right now there is one educational problem that is more grave, more basic than all others. That is the problem of drugs in our schools.

When a child cannot read at age eight, he can, with effort, be taught at nine. When a child cannot multiply or divide in the sixth grade, he can be taught in seventh. But when a child ruins his mind with drugs, he may not be able to start again. He may become a casualty.

How serious is our school-age drug problem? The best and most recent survey tells us that in 1985, sixty-one percent of all high school seniors -- roughly two million young men and women -- had at least tried an illicit drug. Forty-one percent had used drugs other than marijuana.

Most initial experiences with drugs now occur before high school. Almost a third of the seventh graders in the state of New York reported that they had used illegal drugs before entering the seventh grade. In a 1983 poll, 25% of fourth graders

reported pressure among their peers to try alcohol and marijuana. Among seventh graders, fifty percent reported pressure to try marijuana.

Now some of these numbers -- particularly those pertaining to regular marijuana use -- are actually lower than they were in the late 70's. But this year, for the first time in five years, they are not lower than they were the year before. The decline in marijuana use has leveled off. And the use of more serious drugs has gone up. Thirteen percent of high school seniors -- the highest percentage ever -- say they have used cocaine at least once in the last year.

Recently, a new, more powerful form of cocaine has become popular with some of the nation's young people in both the cities and suburbs. It's called crack. Crack is relatively inexpensive, and is easier to use than cocaine. Its effect is quicker and more potent. And it may be the most addictive substance known to man. According to press accounts, some users report addiction after just one use. In my view, crack is the modern Medusa -- one look and you're caught.

The use of PCP, or phencyclidine, is also on the rise in some areas. It's particularly popular among inner-city teens. PCP is considered one of the most dangerous drugs available: it attacks the neo-cortex -- the portion of the brain that controls irrational impulses. The drug is a recipe for disaster for the user and for all those who happen to be around him.

The facts on drugs are alarming. They're alarming to us, and they're alarming to our children as well. In 1985, when 13 to 18 year-olds were asked by the Gallup Poll to identify the biggest problems confronting young people today, drugs topped their list. No other problem came close. In addition, four out of five high school students report that state laws regarding drug dealing are too lenient. And four out of five report that state laws regarding drug use -- including marijuana use -- are too lenient. Our children are seeking more forceful help from adults.

Here in the District of Columbia we have seen press reports of students asking school officials to take strong action. In the words of one sixth grader: "If [some] students are bold and brazen enough to be involved with drug trafficking in our schools, endangering my life and many others, then I plead, beg and urge you to make the consequences so stiff that others in the future will be afraid to even give it a second thought."

Drug use concerns our children. It concerns us all. And it's a special concern for our schools. Why? Let me offer four reasons.

First, because students are taking drugs in our school buildings. Among 1985 high school seniors who said they had used cocaine in the last year, 22 percent reported using it in school. Forty-six percent of heavy drug users report using marijuana in school within the last year.

Second, drug use is a school problem because it undermines a student's academic performance. Research tells us that students who use marijuana regularly are twice as likely as other students to average D's and F's. A study conducted in Philadelphia found that drop-outs are twice as likely to be frequent drug users. I think the case here is clear: when a student is using drugs, chances are he is not going to be learning.

Third, drugs can disrupt an entire school. When large numbers of students in a class are on drugs, or absent, it retards the progress not just of the users, but of all those around them who have the good sense and courage to resist drugs. And concentrated drug use brings to a school all those illegal activities whereby users support their habit.

Finally, in addition to being a considerable evil in itself, drug use breeds a host of other threats to the well-being of our children. As Newsweek put it, "There are three ways for a teenager to support a habit, and none of them is legal. There is theft, there is prostitution, and there is dealing drugs to other kids." Insofar as our schools are concerned with the full development of our children, with their moral and intellectual well-being, they must be concerned about the use of drugs, in school and out.

So the question is, what do we do about school-age drug use?

School-based programs of drug prevention are relatively new, and evaluations of the programs are newer still. We are, however, getting an idea of what methods often do not work.

We know that providing information is ineffective when the focus is on the effects of drug use occurring far in the future, and when the description of those effects is overblown.

We also know that approaches that treat drug use as a response to emotional problems, and concentrate on treating those problems, are usually not very effective.

But there is hope. We are gaining an idea of the sorts of approaches that might work. Treating drug use as a social phenomenon -- as a response to pro-drug messages given by peers, adults, and the media -- shows considerable promise. This means making sure that school authorities are sending a clear, unequivocal message to kids that drugs are wrong, and that they should be rejected. It means telling them of the short-term effects that come with drug use. And it means reinforcing student opinion against drug use.

There is also evidence that the qualities conducive to drug-free schools are the qualities that characterize what educational researchers have termed "effective schools."

According to research, "effective schools" are schools that have proved especially successful in educating children from low-income families. They are good schools. Among their common characteristics are strong leadership, school-wide emphasis on basic skills, and high teacher expectations.

I'd like to give a couple of examples of schools exhibiting these qualities that were successful in overcoming severe drug problems. The first is Eastside High School in Paterson, New Jersey.

The principal of Eastside is a man named Joe Clark. When Joe Clark took over at Eastside in 1982, the school was known as a "cauldron of violence and terror." Gangs roamed the halls, robbing fellow students and recruiting girls for prostitution. On opening day in 1981, a student stabbed a security guard. And there were drugs. Drug dealing was rampant and open, and marijuana smoke filled the stairwells.

Joe Clark's response was firm, it was fair, and it was effective. His first day at Eastside, he welcomed students entering the building with the announcement: "This is the new Eastside High School. What was, exists no more."

Clark issued to each student a list of 19 infractions that would bring immediate suspension. Security guards were posted in the stairwells, and passes were required for the bathrooms. Teachers patrolled the cafeteria and the halls. His drug policy was simple: "If you're smoking or dealing, you're out." To pushers, he warned, "If you come here you might just get hurt." That first year, 300 juniors and seniors were expelled for drug and disciplinary violations. He explained it this way: "I was not about to let three hundred hoodlums jeopardize the education of three thousand students."

Yes, Joe Clark's approach was tough. But it worked. And it was fair. "Even the gangs admitted that I was being fair," he says. His method, moreover, was not all hard edges. Joe Clark boosted school spirit, requiring all students to learn the alma mater. He publicly praised outstanding students. And he got to know each student by name. Some he helped go on to college.

Today, drugs are gone from Eastside. And that means some even greater rewards. The year before Joe Clark came, only 56 percent of the school's ninth-graders passed the state's minimum skills test in math; by 1984, 91 percent of the students were passing the test.

As a second example, I'd like to mention Bill Rudolph, principal of Northside High School in Atlanta, Georgia. When Bill Rudolph arrived at Northside, drugs were so prevalent the school was known as "Fantasy Island." Students smoked openly in the halls, and on the front steps of the school. Rudolph realized the extent of the problem when, on opening day, a pungent smoke began pouring into his office. He followed the scent, and discovered a group of students blowing marijuana smoke into the school ventilation system. They were trying, they said, "to turn the whole school on."

Bill Rudolph announced a drug policy that, like Clark's, was clear and simple. "If your child is caught with drugs here," he told parents, "I will make two phone calls. The second one will be to your home." For a few months, Rudolph admits, being principal meant being a policeman. A student caught dealing PCP was searched, discovered with large amounts of the drug, and sent to a detention center. There were other, similar incidents. But gradually, the message got across: No one is "turning on" at Northside anymore.

Like Joe Clark, Bill Rudolph did more than crack down. He boosted school spirit. And he raised academic standards and expectations. Special curricula were created to prepare students

for college. Enrollment in foreign language classes rose 25 percent; in chemistry it rose 50 percent, and in physics, 300 percent. Four years after Rudolph took over, Northside students scored higher than any other school in Atlanta on standardized tests.

Joe Clark and Bill Rudolph are impressive. But can their successes be replicated? Are they unique? Well, I met with Joe Clark, and I asked him that question. He told me, "That's a bunch of balderdash." And he's right. The fact is that there are other principals across the country who have achieved similar results.

A large new infusion of federal money is not the way to deal with the problem of school-age drug abuse. What is crucial is not more money. What is crucial is community support. The Joe Clarks and Bill Rudolphs do not act alone. To succeed, they need our communities behind them. When Joe Clark decided to expel those 300 students with long records of drug and discipline violations, the local board of education called a meeting. One parent showed up to complain. Over four hundred showed up to support Joe Clark. "When a man is about good works," Joe Clark says, "parents see the good things happening, and they say to their children: 'You go there, and you will learn.'"

When Bill Rudolph and Northside High found they could not afford enough staff to curb truancy, parents volunteered for shifts at the school. And the drug crackdown at school was accompanied by a crackdown in the community, initiated by parents.

The parents agreed on a curfew. They agreed to chaperone all parties, and to prohibit drinking and drugs. They called one another to check up on children's whereabouts. And at night they waited up to meet their children when they came home. Children who broke the rules were grounded, prevented from seeing friends, and denied car privileges. "I realized," Rudolph said later, "that parents had been the missing ingredient in my plans to turn the school around."

In his Gorgias, Plato tells us that no one can be a good citizen alone. Well, no one is going to solve the drug problem alone either.

Parents must be actively involved. They must tell their children that the use of illegal drugs will not be tolerated, and they must enforce this lesson by the power of their own example. Parents must support educators and encourage them to take all necessary steps to get drugs out of our schools. Parents must also help each other by supervising children and seeing that healthy drug-free activities are available. And they should contact school personnel and other parents when they have reason to believe that children from other families are involved with the use of illegal drugs. Joyce Nalepka, president of the National Federation of Parents for Drug-Free Youth, has said that the telephone is the most effective tool we can employ in combating school-age drug abuse.

Joe Clark's Eastside and Bill Rudolph's Northside exemplify the approach that communities will have to take to get drugs out of their schools. They are going to have to pull to-

gether. They are going to have to get tough. They may find, like Joe Clark, that occasionally they need to bring in the police. So be it. They may find, like Bill Rudolph, that occasionally they have to act like police themselves. Again, so be it. It will not be pleasant. But where there are drugs, for the sake of the children, these things must be done.

School boards can lead the way by setting tougher rules themselves. Recently, narcotics officers arrested several Washington students for selling drugs to their classmates. The students were identified by their expensive clothing and the electronic pagers they carried to ensure that classes did not interfere with sales. Right now, the strongest penalty this and many other school districts will give student dealers is a ten-day suspension. That only ensures, say the law enforcement officers I've spoken with, that the students will be greeted as conquering heroes when they return. In the words of the Washington Post, school boards should "give ... administrators the best tool they could have: the ability to expel students involved in drug activity. Kick the pushers out."

What is the federal government's role in addressing the problem of student drug abuse? Clearly, we have a major part to play in the enforcement of laws governing drug use and drug sales. The federal government has a potent new weapon in the Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1984, which makes it a federal crime to distribute a controlled substance within 1000 feet of a school. Earlier this month, several of the Washington

students I just mentioned, who were 18 and 19 years old, were indicted under the Act. If convicted, the students could serve up to 30 years in jail. "If they can sell drugs," says U.S. Attorney Joseph diGenova, "they can do the time. "To those who perceive these charges as heavy-handed," he added, "I suggest they go into the schools where teachers and principals are fighting to maintain civility...."

In the 1986 fiscal year the federal government will spend \$1.7 billion to support anti-drug programs. These funds will be devoted to law enforcement efforts, prevention, medical treatment, and research. In addition, the federal government provides \$300 million to state-administered alcohol and drug services. We at the Department of Education are working with a number of federal agencies on the drug abuse problem. The Department is represented on the Cabinet's Domestic Policy Council Working Group on Drug Abuse and Health issues, which coordinates federal efforts against drug abuse. In addition, we participate with the Justice Department in the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. And the Department of Education has joined with the National Institute for Drug Abuse to sponsor a series of regional conferences for state alcohol and drug abuse prevention personnel and parent groups.

The Department of Education also administers an alcohol and drug abuse education program through its Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. Since 1976, this program has funded

prevention efforts that foster a "school team approach." Typically, a team consisting of school administrators, teachers, parents, students, and community members submits a proposal for prevention efforts and receives training at one of five regional training centers funded under the Department's program. The program has trained 4,650 teams and a total of 18,700 individuals. In 1985, this program was supported by \$4 million from non-federal sources in addition to the monies provided by the Department of Education.

Over the years, perhaps the most important role of the federal Department of Education has been to provide information: information on the condition of American education, and on which educational methods are effective, are working, and which are not.

I believe that drug prevention is a realm in which our dissemination of information can make a particularly important contribution. As I said earlier, research on school-based programs is by no means complete, but as Joe Clark, Bill Rudolph, and their communities show, there are certain basic measures that are effective. These measures do not cost a great amount of money: laying down rules and standing by them is not an expensive proposition. But we need to get the word out. We need to tell the people in the trenches -- the parents, teachers, principals, school boards, and religious and community groups -- what works in drug abuse prevention.

This summer, the Department will publish a book summarizing the available data on effective methods of drug abuse prevention. The book will be a follow-up to What Works, a guide to effective educational techniques that has proved remarkably popular.

Like What Works, our new drug abuse prevention book will be a straightforward, useful summary of the best information available on the subject. Like What Works, it will be aimed not at other researchers or other bureaucrats, but at the nation's chief educational practioners -- parents, teachers, principals and school administrators. It will be a handbook that they can understand, and that they can use -- and that they can obtain free of charge. We think it will be a valuable guide in communities' assault on drugs.

Mr. Chairman, this is the nature of the drug problem as I see it, and some of the steps that I believe we -- parents, educators, legislators and police -- will have to take to address it. I know the problem of drugs among our youth is one that has long concerned you too, and one that you have been a leader in addressing. I look forward to working with you in the hope of removing the scourge of drugs from our schools, and from our children. Again, I appreciate this opportunity to testify here today, and I welcome your questions and those of the committee.

Thank you.

○